The Advancing Hour

The Advancing Hour

Norman Hapgood
Ex-Minister to Denmark

"They fed not on the advancing hour."
GEORGE MEREDITH



D619
.H28

Copyright, 1920, by
BONI & LIVERIGHT, Inc.

Printed in the United States of America

JUL 21 1920
©CLA570794

To

THE YOUTH OF AMERICA

CONTENTS

PAGE

INTRODUCTION. IN TIME OF REVOLUTION. What kind of person is fit to live in times like these ix

CHAPTER I. THE STORM CELLAR. Is America now the home of reaction? 1

CHAPTER II. THE BLOCKADE OF THOUGHT. How the ordinary reader is misled by the newspapers and by government statements 13

CHAPTER III. WHAT THE ISSUES ARE. 39

A. The issue of our duty to other countries. How a parallel situation was treated by George Washington.

B. The issue between the classes. Why the industrial revolution cannot be stopped. How it should be guided.

CHAPTER IV. WITHOUT A PARTY. Why the two big parties in America mean nothing. The Bull Moose effort. Third party outlook today 69

CHAPTER V. FACING BOLSHEVISM: OUR FOLLIES IN RUSSIA. What President Wilson called the Acid Test. The policy of the Entente seen as a crime 87

CHAPTER VI. FACING BOLSHEVISM: THE FUTURE IN RUSSIA. The relation between the Soviet government and the Russian people. The productive forces 128

CHAPTER VII. IS SOCIALISM NEEDED? What Socialism has gained from the world-war and what it has lost 153

CHAPTER VIII. THE ANSWER OF COOPERATION. A rapidly growing movement that works against extreme private capitalism by voluntary action, without forcing anybody. The guild movement. How railroad rates foster monopoly. How they might help to diversity and to small units. American beginnings in Cooperation. 168

PAGE

CHAPTER IX. THE ANSWER OF LIBERALISM. The reforms that liberals must bring about soon if socialism is to be avoided. Getting rid of the proletariat. Continuity of production and the right to steady employment. The Drama of Pig Iron. The story of panics and how to avoid them. The government's proper function. Our bad system. Insurance. Copartnership between capital and labor. American business men. The attitude of lawyers. The Brandeis case and the Supreme Court. A Summary of Liberalism . . 206

CHAPTER X. FROM WILSONISM TO THE FUTURE. The President's vision. The littleness of his enemies. The mistake of 1918. Mexico 234

CHAPTER XI. WHAT IS OUR FAITH? The moral cultural or religious changes that must accompany the economic and political changes 254

INTRODUCTION

IN TIME OF REVOLUTION

WHAT momentous questions greet the earnest youth to-day! Was ever a time more complex; more heavy with consequence?

Not every mind and temper is fit to live through such turmoil. The closed mind, the angry temper, is a mere obstruction. To meet the opportunity are needed the brain wide open to the new, the heart fresh, without anger or fear. My title comes from a verse story by Meredith, in which two good people are destroyed because "they fed not on the advancing hours." Those who are worthy to live to-day, in a double revolution (shifting of class power and shifting of the nations) are those who enter into the time, heartily become part of it, helpfully give it welcome.

This book is an attempt to put forward in concrete form some of the most pressing of the issues. Only by an aroused public opinion in the great countries can the way out be found. We must be stirred from the fixity of our mental habits. The leaders of reaction are making a strong fight, not-

ably in America. Such men are often able and shrewd, but they are short of vision. Their victories are Pyrrhic. They cause needless resentment against our institutions. Those institutions, freely adapted to our advancing needs, are sound. Stupidly administered they will sooner or later be upset. If a radical is one who by nature prefers sudden change and violent remedies then I am not a radical. My conception of the world does differ essentially (radically, in short) from the world we now live in, but I have no confidence in the ability of the human mind, whether Karl Marx's or another, to sit down with a pencil and a sheet of paper and draw up a world-life. Even gardening is experimental, and varies according to species, climate, and individual caprice; and man is more complex than plants. Moreover it is easier to wreck a complicated modern machine, like a locomotive or a watch, than it is to invent it or improve it. A liberal differs from a radical in humility. He concentrates on certain changes, good in themselves and also carrying the seeds of further change, but he leaves later steps to later times. His faith is that if the next step taken by us is important and of right direction we shall have done all that belongs to our moment.

It is the make-believe liberal, or the coward, who is worse than useless, and who gives up leadership,

in times like these, to the radicals, because his own leadership is meaningless. In convulsions, especially, we need the courage to look at everything and then to act on what we see. The greatest revolution before the one through which we are now living was begun in 1789. It had been raging over Europe, with the forces of respectability against it, for six years when Charles James Fox said: "It is not the law that is to be found in books that constitutes, that has constituted, the true principle of freedom in any country at any time. No, it is the energy, the boldness of a man's mind which prompts him to speak not in private, but in large and popular assemblies, that constitutes, that creates in a state the spirit of freedom. This is the principle that gives life to liberty; without it the human character is a stranger to freedom." It was on the verge of America's greatest war that Abraham Lincoln said: "This country, with its institutions, belongs to the people who inhabit it. Whenever they shall grow weary of the existing Government, they can exercise their constitutional right of amending it, or their revolutionary right to dismember or overthrow it."

Do not such memories make us ashamed to study the present discontents otherwise than with the eye of candor? Convulsions test what there is in us. Let me quote from one more figure of the past. It

is Châteaubriand: "Two conditions bring about revolutions in empires: when events are too big and men too small, or when events are commonplace and men beyond the usual moral stature. In the first case everything is ruined, in the second everything is saved."

Of what we have been through we may say that events were too big and men too small. Of what is still to go through we may hope that man will arise to his height before it is too late. Mr. Lloyd George, speaking at a church gathering, warned his hearers that at the end of the war would come a moment when things could be accomplished of greater permanent importance than the war itself. The world just then would be molten. Would there be sufficient preparation to take advantage of this fluid moment? Soon the world would cool down again into hard shapes, and the opportunity would be gone. The golden moment did come, but it passed. The work of the statesmen at Paris was disappointing. But although the most favorable moment passed, the settling down of the world has been delayed, and opportunities still remain. We cannot turn back. We must live into events and solve them. Otherwise what is best will perish. In fertile change alone is life.

The publisher believes (no doubt he is right) that this introduction should contain an exact state-

ment of my position on the Russian problem, since it is around that problem that my most recent controversies have centered. The more elaborate treatment must be sought in chapters V, VI, VII and VIII, but my conclusion on the point most in dispute, as it faces the world in June, 1920, is this:

The Bolshevik government is a de facto government. Not the most violent misrepresentation, not the most energetic use of the passport control to prevent knowledge, can any longer cover the fact that there is an actual functioning government. That it has not been able to conduct industry on communistic principles is sufficiently pointed out in this book, but it does rule the country politically. All efforts at overthrow by force have been striking failures. If Poland or any other country is used as a cat'spaw by France, to keep up the military effort, that country will pay a heavy penalty. The best thing for Russia would be some kind of recognition, however limited, of the Soviet government. It is usually well to recognize facts. Recognition may be hedged about with such reservations as we think useful. When the European powers recognized the United States we were a country that practiced ownership in human beings. The foreign countries could have made, if they had thought best, a reservation on the subject of slavery, but it would have been wise for them just the same to recognize that

we were a functioning government. Actually they were wise to leave slavery to us, as we should be wise to leave to Russia the question of communism and the question of the present dictatorship. I happen myself not to believe in the communism which Bolshevik theory represents. What if I don't? Neither do I believe in many of the exaggerations of private capitalism in my own country. Coercing Russia is not my affair.

Trade and intercourse are our only weapons. With these we may help the evolution away from communism, in so far as that communism proves unsound in practice. No government has any moral right to limit trade with Russia. Let the individual trader alone. Nobody can equal him in influence. He may care to risk his money in trade with individuals in Russia, as was done even during the severest period of the blockade. It is impossible to tell whether or not the communists will successfully destroy the coöperatives. A foreigner may choose to deal directly with the government itself. It is his business; his alone. Personally I shall be glad of every trade that is made—private, coöperative, or governmental. Every trade in Russia, no matter with whom, will do two things. First, it will help to build up Russia and hence the central powers and the world. Second, it will tend to force the government (if a Socialist government

continues to hold power) further and further toward the right, toward greater concessions to private independence. Many people know that these views were held to be a grave fault in men in the fall of 1919.

The question of recognition has become a serious one only since the Bolshevik victories of last fall. There was no reason to recognize the Soviet government while the control of Russia was in real dispute, and it was only the folly of supporting Kolchak, Denikin and Yudenich that made it impossible to have a clear and justifiable position. Either we should have given friendly although informal recognition to each government in its own region of control or we should have given no support or recognition to any. The arguments against recognition of the Soviet government after its complete victory are expressed by the National Civic Federation in a statement published March 29th, 1920, and this statement may be taken, I think, as representing the understandable horror of recognizing a government representing ideas of which they disapprove. The statement says:

"We believe that recognition of Soviet Russia would be a repudiation of all that our national life has represented for a hundred and fifty years, and of all the spiritual ideals for which modern civilization has striven for two thousand years."

Is there any reason why that statement should not have been printed one hundred and twenty-five years ago about the French revolution? As the names signed to the protest are some of the most distinguished in America it is worth while to notice the reasoning. It is the kind of reasoning which does most to justify distrust of any league of nations as tending to be a Holy Alliance, and my intense hope in a league of nations is one of the causes that make me regret so bitterly our bourbonism about Russia. This statement speaks of the Soviet government as "aiming to destroy the bulwarks of morality and social order." It endeavors to destroy the bulwarks of one morality and of one social order. Shall we prevent the endeavor? Shall there never be a change in morality and social order? The statement says that Soviet tenets "made marriage a mere civil contract which may be broken by either party." The language is wholly unfair to the Soviet marriage law, but those who signed the statement might well ask themselves whether the world to-day is purified by pretending that marriage is a religious sacrament rather than an important civic status. "Its system and franchise destroy representative government." Have the signers ever read the franchise system? Or are they confusedly mixing up the system with the Bolshevik war-dictatorship? "Soviet tenets attempted

to interdict the teaching of religion." This is an over-simplified, propaganda statement, but it is true that the Bolsheviks endeavored to break down the hold of a church closely linked with the old régime in Russia. Is that our affair? The National Civic Federation becomes merely funny when it speaks of the danger of "an endless stream of inspired press stories from Moscow and Petrograd." Are the signers children to believe that the Soviet side of the argument has had more hospitable space in our newspapers and news agencies than the anti-Soviet side? Are the wealthy gentlemen who own our leading papers in a conspiracy to print only the Soviet side?[1]

The silliness of such implications, the fright of them, is filled with danger. To suppose that we, thousands of miles away, drugged with war-propaganda, are to accept or reject foreign governments on such grounds as these, is to kill the possibility of international coöperation among liberals.

A few articles, made out of material in this book, have been published in the New Republic, Asia, and the Independent, but the greater part of the book is now published for the first time.

N. H.

New York, June, 1920.

[1] On the morning of Feb. 28th, 1920, when I opened the leading American newspaper, I had a typical experience. Mr. Walter Lipp-

mann had exactly the same experience, for in a speech that same afternoon he said:

"I wish to take one example to illustrate what I have been saying as to the relation between censorship and propaganda. I take it from this morning's newspaper, the New York Times. In Europe, great events are occurring and the British Empire is leading a movement towards peace with Russia. As part of that movement, a peace offer has been made to the United States government by the Russian government. The New York Times this morning states that officials at Washington said it did not differ from previous proposals and that it would not be made public, as it was regarded largely as an effort to further the Soviet propaganda throughout the world.

There is the censorship—the absolute denial that the American people have a right to know the terms of a peace offer made to their government by another government.

Immediately following that news item is another item headed, "Lenine's new plan for world revolution." The date line is Berlin. It states that a Russian emissary, who is traveling through Germany to-day incognito, is believed to be one of the big guns of the Soviet movement. His real name is known only to trusted Communist leaders. On Tuesday evening he spoke at a secret meeting of the chieftains of Communism, to which also some independent Socialists were invited, and what this gentleman said on Tuesday evening is reported in quotes, verbatim, in this morning's Times.

Out of that soil, that soil of blockaded news and advertised fiction, have grown groups of people who have conducted the red hysteria. Moderate people, people with a sense of evidence, people who seek the truth about things they talk about, faced with that kind of thing, have been unable to take a position, to make up their minds. But that has not deterred a lot of other people from making up their minds. Some of these people are inspired by sinister motives. Some are partly hysterical, but those who are most interested are those who are fanatically self-righteous. There are people in this country to-day who believe that they are chosen by God or by the Union League Club to save this country from contamination."

The National Civic Federation might give an evening to debating this opinion of Robert Louis Stevenson:

"It is men who hold another truth, or, as it seems to us, perhaps, a dangerous lie, who can extend our restricted field of knowledge, and rouse our drowsy consciences. Something that seems quite new, or that seems insolently false or very dangerous, is the test of a reader. If he tries to see what it means, what truth excuses it, he has the gift, and let him read. If he is merely hurt or offended, or exclaims upon his author's folly, he had better take to the daily papers; he will never be a reader."

I do not know to what extent I agree or disagree with Thomas Jefferson when he said, "I believe that a revolution every once in a while is a good thing." What I do know is that it would have been a pity if Mr. Jefferson had not been allowed to say it. Zachariah R. Chaffee, Jr., Professor of Law in Harvard University, observes that "the Declaration of Independence advocates the overthrow of any government by force or violence which is destructive of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness"; and in the same speech he said: "In a country where John Adams defended the British soldiers involved in the Boston massacre, and Alexander Hamilton represented British Loyalists, and General Grant favored the release of Jefferson Davis, it is surprising how generally men assume that any one who urges fair treatment for conscientious objectors must be a conscientious objector and any one who believes that the treaty with Germany should not violate the armistice must be a pro-German. It has been impossible for any one to uphold the rights of a minority without subjecting himself to the accusation that he shared their views.

.

I plead for free speech, not in the name of radicalism but in the name of conservatism. At the time of the French Revolution, those who wielded the guillotine overlooked the fact that it came nearer to them with every successive batch of prisoners who were brought under it until at last the most extreme members of society went under the knife. When we see the fate of the Federalist Party in this country, which was a very strong majority, the party which introduced the Sedition Act of 1798; when we see the fate of the Liberal Party in England, which passed the Defense of the Realm Act, and see the small minority they have become, who can say that any one of the two great parties in this country may not in a few years become a small minority? In a part of Wisconsin, one of these parties has already fallen to third place. In North Dakota, one has been captured by the extreme radical group. If we allow this principle of suppression to prevail in this country, we cannot be sure that it will not be used before many years against the conservatives. I ask for the stopping of this principle as a conservative, so that minorities shall be entitled to some rights."

The Advancing Hour

THE ADVANCING HOUR

CHAPTER I

THE STORM CELLAR

"Whosoever, in writing a modern history, shall follow truth too near the heels, it may haply strike out his teeth." Sir Walter Raleigh.

THE jury which found men guilty for publishing news items or editorials like those here in question must have supposed it to be within their province to condemn men not merely for disloyal acts but for a disloyal heart; provided only that the disloyal heart was evidenced by some utterance. To prosecute men for such publications reminds of the days when men were hanged for constructive treason. And, indeed, the jury may well have believed from the charge that the Espionage Act had in effect restored the crime of constructive treason. To hold that such harmless additions to or omissions from news items, and such impotent expressions of editorial opinion, as were shown here, can afford the basis even of a prosecution will doubtless discourage criticism of

the policies of the Government. To hold that such publications can be suppressed as false reports subjects to new perils the constitutional liberty of the press, already seriously curtailed in practice under powers assumed to have been conferred upon the postal authorities. Nor will this grave danger end with the passing of the war. The constitutional right of free speech has been declared to be the same in peace and in war. In peace, too, men may differ widely as to what loyalty to our country demands; and an intolerant majority, swayed by passion or by fear, may be prone in the future, as it has often been in the past, to stamp as disloyal opinions with which it disagrees. Convictions such as these, besides abridging freedom of speech, threaten freedom of thought and of belief."

Mr. Justice Brandeis dissenting (with Mr. Justice Holmes) in Schaefer et al. vs. the U. S.

When in 1917 I first read the generalization about history, that in a war the belligerents are likely to exchange national characteristics, I was faintly interested. Just now my interest is grave. My own country has been illustrating dramatically the bad end of the exchange. Germany and Russia, shedding their old despotisms, have a strong probability of settling into interesting democracies. England, not much injured mentally by the war, is

leading the world in preparing for industrial democracy, as she has so long led the larger nations in political democracy. France is less free in mind than before the war, but even in France the change is slight compared to ours. The United States in six years, mainly in three years, passed into a despotic spirit comparable only to what Russia and Prussia were before 1914. There are signs of improvement, but there is every need of frankness and determination.

I know that for the fear, cruelty and vagueness that have oppressed our country the reasons are excellent. Our repressiveness is based on danger to the republic; on plots turned up by the police; on potential revolution; on the need of law and order; on patriotism. It is based on exactly the reasons always put forward by the German and Russian oligarchies. The excuse behind the reasoning, however, is slimmer than in either of the foreign despotisms. The Czar actually was in constant physical peril. Every step ahead was a peril. A Russian princess said to me: "Our first mistake was when we freed the serfs. Since then the peasants have been always thinking they could get more." The Kaiser and his shining ones faced not only the vengeance of France, the mysterious possibilities of Russia, the far-seeing menace of England, but they dealt with a growth in socialism that was

rapid and in their minds degenerate. We are a nation with natural resources undiminished; protected by the oceans; with centuries of British free tradition behind us; with all our hundred millions, except the merest fraction, accepting our general form of government; and yet we have recently gone far in abandoning the grand old Anglo-American traditions and taking over those of the Czars and Kaisers.

Nor is that the worst. England from time to time has gone through panics of thought-control, but always there have been men of eminence to rise and defy the frightened animal, and such men have kept the country's spirit great. On my return to America from Denmark in December, 1919, what struck me was the silence of such liberal leaders as remain. A few editors, a few clergymen kept their nerve. A few politicians and lawyers have spoken since then, although most of them without full indignation; and how many, alas, whom we had counted liberal have found one excuse and another for joining the pack and crying down the trail!

There are many forms of courage, of which we may distinguish three. That the physical form is highly developed in all modern nations, recent most heroic endurances have proved. If moral courage means the willingness to brave penalties in defense of simple moral convictions, that species is not so

rare as intellectual courage, or willingness to make sacrifices for our own thought-out intellectual beliefs. In America this intellectual courage has shown itself in those realms in which we are interested. Many a business man has put his own lonely thought into execution. But mental independence has been singularly lacking in the general realms of thought, because for a long time we have not been interested in thought. In the present crisis, if we had possessed any seriousness about the bases of liberty, our leaders could not have been divided into those who helped to stampede the country into a pitiful Prussianism and those who acquiesced in the stampede.

I would not overstate the case, and therefore it should be added that many individuals have been kept silent not from cowardice, but from a sense of futility that is so often felt in American life by minorities. These persons feel that they have no power to lead the many out of their mania and that the public will of itself emerge when in the infinitude of God's wisdom the time is ripe. I wish to state their case fairly, and Ironquill has done it for them:

"Once a Kansas zephyr strayed
Where a brass-eyed bird-pup played.
And that canine bayed
At that zephyr, in a gay
Semi-idiotic way.

Then that zephyr, in about
Half a jiffy, took that pup,
Tipped him over, wrong side up,
Then it turned him wrong side out.

And it calmly journeyed thence,
With a barn and string of fence."

The moral drawn by Ironquill is exactly that of the public at the present moment:

"When communities turn loose
Social forces that produce
The disorders of a gale,
Act upon the well known law:
Face the breeze but close your jaw.
It's a rule that will not fail.
If you bay it in a gay,
Self-sufficient sort of way,
It will land you without doubt
Upside down and wrong side out."

Many of my friends who are not cowards have stayed in the storm cellar, not primarily because they found it safe, but because they felt that protest on their part would accomplish nothing and would further infuriate the public beast. We went through a similar stage in the war against Germany, although the temper, in ferocity, never equalled this, partly because nothing is so alarming as a threat against a bank account; more, perhaps, because the German danger was thousands of miles

away. In this case, on the contrary, our politicians and our newspapers have vied with one another in depicting the peril as crimson and as on our doorsteps. The enemy is at the gate; inside the gate; his machinations are the subject of proclamation after proclamation; patriotic addresses follow fast; and scareheads know no end. I myself have no love of the storm cellar, but if I allowed myself a diet exclusively on American newspapers, I imagine I might succumb to discouragement and seek standardized peace.

Iago tells of a passion "That doth make the meat it feeds on." The tragedy of all others in this snarl is that our fears create the realities. First we have a fit, in which we see Lenin in every strike, Trotski on every soap box, a wrecked civilization in every reform. As a result of this delirium we pass laws that combine inquisition with punishment for mere opinion. We deport a man without a trial because one inquisitor has reached the conclusion that this man calls himself an anarchist; that he disbelieves in force as a method of bringing about the world he dreams of; but that he looks forward to a remote future in which man will be so changed that there will not be even governmental force. We start a series of political booms, including booms for the Presidency, based on this passion; each candidate wishes to discover more Reds than any other candi-

date and to make more noise about it; prosecuting attorneys, legislators and judges sing epileptic patriotism; and George Bernard Shaw is justified in wondering why anybody stays in America with a free country only seven days away. Unhappy results are inevitable. The discontented labor elements become hopeless. This semi-legal lynching, this violent direct action by the predominant classes, inevitably removes whatever lingering respect may still exist for law and for established custom, and we see an increasing tendency towards sporadic violence and silly paper plots; so that we create what at first was the fright of a dream. Thus the propaganda of six years, first against Germans, then against communists, in taking away intelligence from the public becomes the cause of that kind of violence that is easy to see and to condemn. The silent acceptance of this drugging by our responsible men creates a condition where they have more reason to be afraid of defending our traditional legal and political safeguards, because at any moment a Red idiot or collection of idiots may blow something up.

The situation being so unpromising how can we ask our trained citizen to lift his voice? Shall he endanger his money-earning power, the peace of his relatives, his own good name in a contest so unpromising? Is it not useless, suicidal, to be openly

rational about industrial contests in the present times? I look back over my personal experiences in these recent years with some sadness and with some amusement. In the fall of 1914 I was losing readers and credit by criticizing Germany. In 1917 I was branded as a defeatist for favoring the Stockholm Conference and for believing that a defeat of Germany, not carried too far, would leave her less dangerous than she would be if crushed, humiliated and demoralized. In 1918 I questioned some of the German atrocities, because I feared the remote results of our extravagant propaganda, and one earnest patriot who heard me speak in Rochester reported my speech to the Secret Service and I have no doubt it is in Senator Lodge's dossier against me. Some other patriot sent in the equally damaging opinion that I annoyed the French government in 1917 by writing that the French peasant then desired a settlement by universal understanding rather than by force. One becomes a stage villain easily when the public is crazy. In 1919 the mania modified its form and because I believed Bolshevism could be ended only by peace, prosperity and contact, there were plenty of people to believe the charge fomented by Lodge, that I was an employee of the Moscow government. Before attempting to say why I think there is an obligation on the powerful, a noblesse oblige to stand out

against the mob's blood-lust that the leaders have created, I ought in candor to admit that my own reason for refusing to be reduced to subjection is much less ethical than it is mere unwillingness to be bored. A life spent in sharing these successive spasms might be full of material comfort and of the prestige of being proper, but it would be an ennui so intense that more patience than mine would be required to manage the daily dullness. My sympathy is absolute, however, for two classes of the acquiescent. One class is composed of those who are so placed that if they do not conform they will see their families in genuine distress. The other is composed of those who have read our newspapers and drunk the propaganda for years with no facilities for getting at facts, so that they have come to see all the devils and dangers they are told to see, like a child reading Red Riding Hood. It is to neither of these classes that I appeal, but to men who have not lost the power to think and who also are so placed that they might be honest without losing the ability to feed and educate their young.

For such men there is no cause to which they could dedicate themselves so worthily as the cause of seeking roads away from Prussianism. Great nations did not fight this war to make the world safe for conformity. Conformity means many advantages, but when Thomas Jefferson wrote his own

epitaph he disdained to put on it any external honors. He did not mention that he had been Secretary of State, Vice President or President of the United States. He told only that he had written two documents in favor of human liberty and had founded an institution for the higher learning.

When Daniel Webster picked out the thing that above all others he would leave to his posterity it was a spirit to be remembered now. He is speaking of the right of full and free discussion. He says: "It is not to be drawn into controversy. It is as undoubted as the right of breathing the air and walking on the earth. Belonging to private life as a right, it belongs to public life as a duty. This high constitutional privilege I shall defend and exercise in all places in time of war, in time of peace, and at all times. Living, I will assert it; dying, I will assert it; and should I leave no other inheritance to my children I will leave them the inheritance of free principles and the example of a manly, independent and constitutional defense of them." I wish I could remember who it was that warned the House of Commons against taking from the rattlesnake the rattle by which he gives warning of his approach, and leaving the sting with which he kills. In suppressing opinion we take away the rattle. In failing to put into practice new institutions needed by the time we leave the sting. I inquire

only if a man has fighting blood in that part of him which dwells among ideas. If so, shall he not give battle for those conceptions of freedom handed down to us in the noble English tradition and carried along by the great names in our own history? Let us remember how Washington stood against a public propagandized by seven years of war when he refused to take sides in a later dispute between England and France; how Lincoln was one of only two men to vote right in the Illinois legislature on a bill that touched the most impassioned issue of that day. Is there among us in America none of that pride that makes famous Englishmen dissent from the enraged majority no matter how hot the issue? In a time like this to be free means for a while to be misunderstood. Why not? Is the intellectual life to be all flabby, with no rugged stretches? Is hardihood to exist only in the body? Let us hear the drum music of our own convictions. The ultimate call just now is to spirit. What can a man do better than to refuse to sell his integrity for a mean quiescence?

CHAPTER II

THE BLOCKADE OF THOUGHT

"Men fear thought as they fear nothing else on earth."
Bertrand Russell.

"In a democracy, institutions are worth no more than the public opinion that controls them."
Montesquieu.

As I do not believe we can face, purely and without fear, the new world, until we realize how false are many of the premises on which we base our decisions, I ask the reader to go with me through certain personal experiences in the gathering of facts. I shall not guess, but tell only what I individually know. A large percentage of average men and women desire the truth, and would be willing to follow it, but if a trained journalist, with access to sources of inside information, has to be on his guard constantly against misleading data, what chance has the average reader?

It happened that when the war broke out, in 1914, I was in England; and what, in my memory, remains most vivid, is a little group of men at the

Liberal Club, the night before it became entirely certain that England would enter. These men were students of social welfare. They were familiar with diplomatic history. They were among the self-contained, whom it is difficult to stampede. It is the sadness of their manners that I remember. They knew how destructive is modern war to morals and to intellect. There was no need to join in denouncing Germany. Others would fully accomplish that. These men dwelt rather on the contributions of Germany; on the close votes by which for years the Socialists had failed to shake the despotic system; on the difficulties put in the way of reform by the Anglo-Russian-French entente; on the rising standard of living for German workmen, despite poor soil, scant waterways, inability to enjoy the proceeds of African and Asiatic labor, as British workmen can. We recalled the Moroccan history as a breach of faith on the part of France at Germany's expense, and we trusted neither side to make good use of victory. We heard of resignations from the British cabinet, some by men who believed England should not enter, some by men who, passing no judgment, were unwilling to take part in the endless falsities of war. For my part I felt on that night certain truths that I have felt until now. These principles are sufficiently unpopular to free me from suspicion of boasting. They were

written almost unbrokenly, week by week, in the press; so that I cannot be accused of wisdom after the fact. Some of the guiding points, as they stood out in August, 1914, were these:

(1) The German enterprise of domination must be stopped. As I expect for some years to be combatting the effects of the propaganda that Germans (or Russians) are Huns, I rejoice in the frequency with which my name appeared on the special blacklist of the Staats-Zeitung and the Fatherland, the Fatherland going so far as to credit me with deriving from "a respectable Jewish family by the name of Habgut."

(2) Disillusion for Germany, absence of victory, would be a better cure for Prussianism than would an overwhelming victory for the Entente. I ardently favored the Stockholm Conference. I agreed with Lord Lansdowne about the consequences of "the knockout blow." I believed in a carefully determined plebiscite, even in Alsace-Lorraine, said so, and thereby got into disfavor. Later on I did not like the language used in the fourteen points about the size of the new Poland, a view that proved particularly unpopular, as expressed by me in the press. Realizing Wilson's endless difficulties, and the majestic triumphs that with better support might have been his, I believe his thought was truest and also most expressive of

himself when he stood for his carefully considered expression "peace without victory." In short, I was a "defeatist." In 1917 I expressed to one of England's most eminent men of letters the view that a defeat of Germany would cure her more effectually than a crushing, whereupon he burst into a rage so distressing that I retreated. "Oh," he cried, "you are very careful about what is for the welfare of Germany! What about us? What about the sons we have lost? What"

(3) Next, in this list of principles held in 1914, and held now, was that for a man to change his opinions as soon as he is compelled to take his stand in war, is shameful. Be it said of these intellectual Englishmen of August, 1914, they have not shed their convictions. Although none of them were young, some went into the war, and nevertheless remained just. They could even fight without taking the opium of falsehood. Sir John Simon, a leader among the forces of reason, in the dark days of the spring of 1917, said that as a moment had come when only physical force could resist Germany's conquest he felt driven to resign his seat in the House of Commons and, in spite of his age and habits of life, to ask to be assigned to the army. Another member of the House of Commons, Josiah Wedgwood, international and universal in his sympathies, a bold dissenter always against popular

folly, now a grandfather, volunteered immediately, fought in Antwerp, fought in a tank in Flanders, was badly wounded at Gallipoli, was sent by Mr. Balfour to see Lenin and report on the situation, was recalled from Vladivostok because his advice cabled from there was contrary to the fixed intentions of the Government, went smilingly back to his seat in the House to make trouble for the smug, and finally, wearying of the cowardice of liberalism, joined the labor party, becoming particularly active in the parliamentary fight against the hypocritical, greedy, and ignorant interference in Russia. Of such men is derived the glory of the British character. Of General Smuts I need not speak. I will but tell one thing not known: that in 1917 he said to Lord Milner: "In the South African war you kept us fighting a year longer than was necessary, because we did not know your terms. Don't make the same mistake on a larger scale with Germany."

No doubt those Englishmen who, like Ramsay MacDonald, in 1914 opposed the entry of England into the war, paid a price in public standing, and I think their judgment was inferior to that of Smuts and Cecil; but truth is multiform, and they were a thousand times less wrong, and more courageous, than the Northcliffes, Churchills and Morning Posts, who have poisoned the victory. The type that is beyond criticism, a beacon for moral war, is

the type that in August of 1914 saw the need of fighting, but in 1919 equally saw the need of forgiving; that took part in the resistance, and followed it with that great adventure, faith.

When I left England, the German armies were approaching Liège and Namur. The ship on which I crossed carried many German-Americans. Their talk about the war was friendly, but full of error. They knew enough not to imagine, as we imagined then, that the Belgian forts might hold; but in their lurid confidence they believed London would be unsafe within a month. They talked, with eloquence, of the power of discipline; they had no conception of the dangers of overtraining. When I reached America, I found my countrymen almost completely ignorant, but better oriented in their ignorance than they became in the days of the American Defense Society and the Sisson documents.

In 1915 I went back again to England, Ireland, and France. In Queenstown I looked over the faces of the Lusitania's dead, seeking one of my dearest friends, but in the horror of it I could see no reason for plunging deeper into hatred. In France I speedily learned to take less interest in the facile stories of German propaganda and more interest in the methods of propaganda that I saw immediately in front of me. For example: once I

was on a certain hill in France when a few scattered shots led us to go to a village the commander of which had not been warned that any correspondents were coming. The Captain in charge of us showed us that practically the only damage done to the town had been done to the hospital and its immediate vicinity. As I always try to do, when seeking news, I got away from my keepers and wandered about alone. By good luck I met the French officer commanding the town. "Tell me," I inquired, "is it true that the Germans shot up the hospital on purpose?" "Certainly," he replied. "Why not? We had a battery behind it." Which was not in the propaganda arrangements.

Mr. L. is an extremely intimate friend of mine, and a most exact reporter. The following fact I have from him. He was abroad on official business, when the Captain of a British destroyer told him that a submarine had surrendered to his ship. He had the crew come on his ship, and then: "I ordered them to be taken below and thrown one by one into the furnace," he said.

We had been talking, my friend and I, of the accepted rule, in gathering evidence of German atrocities, that you can take as true what a man says against his army or himself. Of course, neither of us believed this British Captain. He was making a sensation, as a large minority of men do who have

been in exciting situations. Most people are like the correspondent of an American newspaper, with whom I spent several days, when conditions happened to be distressingly quiet, so that it was a subject for jokes. As always, however, our automobile had to go fast when it was within reach of the German guns. This was the only fact the correspondent had to go on. We rode back to Paris together. The nearer we got to the city the more useful my companion's memory became. Before we arrived he declared that in all his war experiences he had not had quite the sense of peril he had known that week; and the readers of his newspaper got the benefit of his intensity. Even in ordinary times those who seek the truth are few, the majority welcoming allegations that fortify them in their desires.

I went back to France in 1917. Nobody doubts that Monsieur Clemenceau, an extraordinarily able individual, had much to do not only with winning the war but also with the extremely different work of deciding what kind of a moral universe was to be handed to us to live in as a result of the victory. I never saw the Tiger but once. It happened thus: There were in France, in 1917, a number of journalists who were wearied and ashamed of the news that went from Europe to the United States. They formed an organization for two purposes: (1) To try to induce American newspapers to send more

serious correspondents abroad. (2) To endeavor, once the quality of the correspondents was improved, to take all possible steps to weaken the blockade against thought, and to acquire permission from the French and American censorships to send, not stereotyped and standardized propaganda, but the natural variety of views from the standpoint of a group of responsible observers. These men included such writers as John Bass, Will Irwin, and Herbert Corey. They sympathized with the censorship when it was merely endeavoring to stop sensational and improper news "beats" or "scare stories," which a correspondent with a due sense of his obligations would not endeavor to send anyway, and many of them were frankly ashamed of the kind of men representing many conspicuous newspapers, although not less ashamed of the anesthetic nature of the news conveyed by all propaganda departments including our own.

I was made President of this organization and as my first duty told to see M. Clemenceau, who had just become Premier, and deliver an address and a request. I was instructed to describe the make-up of the organization and its spirit, and to add that the men composing it had every reason to congratulate themselves, as journalists, on the advent of M. Clemenceau, since his campaign against his predecessors in power had been largely an attack on the

censorship. The newspapers had practically all said that M. Clemenceau intended to put an immediate end to the political side of the censorship. I therefore turned up in his office. He was seventy-five at the time. He came across the floor, looking like a hearty man of sixty and walking like an active man of forty, and then sat back at his desk to listen. I made my speech. The explanatory and polite introduction went smoothly. When I came to the expectation that the political censorship would be removed or seriously modified he broke in: "Everything will be as before. There will be no change whatever. Why should there be?"

I recited the announcements in the newspapers: "Well," he said, "you are a newspaper man yourself. You know how to take such things."

All my answer was there, in the change from the man out of power to the man in power, but as I had completely failed in the definite object of my mission, I thought I might at least obtain a banality for our organization and the public, so I said:

"I am sorry we misunderstood your position. We are anxious to say something to the United States about your attitude toward printing the truth. May I say at least that you agree that a self-governing nation will fight better if it is allowed to know the essential facts than if it is kept in ignorance?"

"Yes," he said. "You may say that," and with

the harmless cargo of a generalization, expressed in words not to be acted on, I returned to report.

A little while later M. Clemenceau gave to the Paris correspondent of the Manchester Guardian a few hours in which to pack his things and get out of France. No reason was given, but his persistent publication of inside information about treaties and negotiations was generally accepted as the reason. M. Clemenceau was by no means alone in thinking that the Guardian should be as far as possible interfered with in its mission of telling the truth in a large and instructive way. That paper is never sensational, never unpatriotic, never indiscreet. It represents the liberal mind in a form that would enable liberalism to live, by meeting the problems of the present age. It is the one daily paper that I cannot do without, in whatever country I may be, partly on account of its sound and illuminating opinions but even more on account of its news, which far outweighs in significance the news in any other paper. I emphasize all this because, in order to mark the degree to which mental freedom is distasteful to the war-and-power mind, it is important to distinguish between extreme radicalism and sane liberalism. If Clemenceau had merely held down peace-at-any-price, internationalist-minded publications, it would have been a different story. If the British Government, the most liberal of all fighting

governments, had merely forbidden the foreign circulation, during the war, of publications like the Nation and the Cambridge Magazine, and imprisoned men as uncompromisingly profound and honest as Bertrand Russell, it would have been another exercise of power, that might perhaps have been justified on the ground of reasonable coherence in a crisis; but the issue shifts when we see, after the war, the British secretly instigating the Esthonians to imprison an academically-trained correspondent of the Guardian, because he came from Soviet Russia and might tell something; or when we see Mr. Lloyd George putting out an official denial that he ever heard of Mr. Bullitt. "There is no mounting to power," said Bacon, "except by crooked stairs." Much of the falsity of governments during and immediately after the war is due to fear, but much also to the lust for personal power.

Once, talking to a foreign statesman, I said that the Guardian seemed to me to show what journalism ought to be.

"But do you find that it represents British opinion?" he asked.

"It represents the permanently best in British opinion," I replied. "From other publications I can get the fleeting mob-mind. The more important thing is to get from a newspaper the facts as truthfully as may be."

As England is politically the freest great power in the world, I will recall a few other examples of the shamelessness with which truth is put aside in war-time, whether by the government, the press, or the public.

David Lloyd George has done much, very much, for liberalism and human freedom, yet what will history say of the ruthless mendacity with which he handled the issue of Kerenski and the Stockholm conference? Then the future of the world was at stake, but the truth could not be trusted. It was not enough to refuse to allow laboring men to meet and consider. It was necessary to falsify the wishes of Kerenski. The British Government was very gentle with the Czar. I happened to be at the British front in France when the first Russian revolution broke, in March, 1917. It was natural that officers should be alarmed by a great political change in war-time. It was only when I got back to England that I began to be discouraged by having it borne in on me that the will to get on top of the antagonist was more deeply rooted than the will to gain freedom for the world. I well remember what a long breath I drew when I heard Josiah Wedgwood say: "I care less how the war against Germany goes now, for the Russian revolution assures an advance in freedom to the world." Wedgwood's statement about Germany was, of course, only the exaggera-

tion of a generous nature in the flush of enthusiasm, but the ardor with which he received the turn against despotism in a country of nearly 200 millions has never ceased. With too many people, even in England, it ceased as soon as it seemed to threaten, first the military situation and second the property security of the world. In parliament Mr. Churchill charged Col. Wedgwood with encouraging a class war. Col. Wedgwood replied that it was the interventionists who were encouraging the class war, but if there must be such a war his mind was clear about the side on which he should fight. That gallant gentleman's desertion of the Liberal Party for the Labor Party cannot be imitated by men of good will and enlightenment in this country, because we have as yet no strong and representative radical third party.

From England, with her superb political record, let us take a few more illustrations of war's poison. Among the most detestable propaganda-lies of all the war was the charge that the Bolsheviks aimed to lower the moral position of women; the so-called nationalization of women. At one time it was natural for simple and angry minds to believe this tale. Did not every one of us have acquaintances who in August, 1914, had personally seen the Russian army passing through Scotland or England? Did any of us lack a friend who had

received a letter from Germany, all optimism within, with "we are starving" written underneath the stamp? What overwhelming evidence there was of the cutting off of the Belgian boys' hands, and of the factory for making grease of human bodies!

Lord Robert Cecil is one of my heroes, and yet he said there was reason to believe the story about the German factory for making grease out of human bodies. Here is the history of that story. Von Bissing once said to a very distinguished American, a good friend of mine: "Everything I have done has made the Belgians angry, but I have thought of something at last that I believe will please them." He described the rotting horses, especially difficult to bury in winter, and his plan for getting rid of the bodies and even rendering them useful.

Another acquaintance of mine was with the German army when this factory was in operation but before the news of it had reached the Entente press. A General said to him, and to the other journalists with him: "You are welcome to tell all you have seen, except that I would rather you should not mention the Kadaver factory. If you do, the British are sure to say we use human corpses there."

Not that I should have blamed the Germans if they had taken that step, but my opinion on that subject is neither here nor there. The Northcliffe press started the story and proved it by quotations

from the German newspapers, who with singular naïveté told about the Kadaver factory with no embarrassment. Immediately Englishmen who knew German pointed out that Kadaver meant in German the body of an animal, never meaning a human body except in the one case of dissection. "I wish," said one of Northcliffe's men to me with a laugh, "that the word 'leichnam' or 'leiche' had been used." But the Northcliffe papers printed German facsimiles that few of their readers understood and doubtless left on the general public the impression that they had told the truth.

Perhaps here I ought to say that even the amazing percentage of mendacity that is produced in such times as these is frequently done purely in the service of virtue.

It was not to me, but to an intimate friend, that an old lady, caught in falsehood about having herself seen the hands of Belgian boys cut off by German order, replied: "Yes, it is a fact that I did not see the deed myself. The Duchesse de Sceauinsceau, however, who is the soul of honor, saw it. If I had written my American friends that the Duchesse saw it, they, not knowing her, might not believe it; but as I knew she could never tell an untruth, I gave the right impression by saying I saw the act myself." Much of the evidence with which the war reeked was based on motives as high, and

so will be based much of the presentation against labor in the most respectable circles in the days through which we are to live.

A friend of mine, an officer, was in Russia at the time of the revolution of November. One day some time later he was listening to an account of Bolshevik atrocities from an eye-witness of them. One incident was that two nurses had had both arms cut off, and when help arrived they were standing weeping and telling about what had happened. My friend expressed surprise that a person could stand for six hours with both arms cut off, and ventured the opinion that if not dead the nurses would be at least unconscious. The narrator's answer was patriotic. "I see," he said, "that you are not a friend of Russia."

A man who occupied successfully a high position in the American government said to me: "I was part of the lie-factory myself. Of course we acted for the best of reasons."

What happened to Hus, Bruno, Socrates, Savonarola, Joan of Arc, and Jesus Christ? Also, why did it happen? Were not all the reasons admirable?

My impulse to write first about morasses of falsehood is more than an interest in the workings of the human brain. The fantastic tricks with which we weigh evidence has a direct personal importance for those of us who only on a foundation cleared of

hypocrisy can build a faith that is assured; a faith whose requirement is not deception but the unbending will to see. The great battle to-day throughout the world is between three general groups of men. We call them extremists, conservatives, liberals; or theorists, reactionaries, moderates; but, whatever the names, they are three real types. Often it looks as if those of the liberal group are to be pushed aside or forced into one of the two great armies. If that be so, then must I be pushed to the left; for to go to the right would be to abandon the flag. Better numberless mistakes than fear; better stumble than never climb; better any fate than surrender. But before we liberals allow ourselves to be driven by follies of the standpatters into the ranks of the extreme left, we should make eloquent our belief in ordered progress, and endeavor that it may be actual progress. If I sketch hypocrisy, fear, greed, as I have observed those master-forces, it is that optimism may rest on the open mind. *Fiat justitia, ruat cælum;* but the answer comes, if justice is done we shall be nearer heaven; and to do justice we must not be afraid of thought. Although Americans on certain subjects think admirably, they dislike to examine foundations. The time is coming when the foundations must be examined: when they must be altered. The industrial revolution is with us. The only question is in what manner it will be con-

ducted, and by whom. The world's attention has shifted to the laboring majority, and no cruel closing of the property ranks can hold off change. With the standpatters rests the choice between painless evolution and evolution by shock. I cling to my hope in their intelligence, but the hope is none too sure: it is rather will and determined faith. On the liberals also our reliance is not too strong, for so few of them are genuine and resourceful. The laboring masses, knowing sweat and anxiety, smile scornfully at reform by hypocrites, or at reform by cowards. The lazy and violent among them, in these days of concentrated machinery and industrial centers, can be held in check only by intelligent labor itself. Intelligent labor will coöperate with a liberalism that understands what has been settled and what has been fought out. Assuredly it will not coöperate with capitalists who imagine that collective bargaining is a matter that can still be argued. Assuredly it will not trust a combination that uses beggarly doles, in so-called profit-sharing and pensions, as feeble breast-works to resist the right of men to organize, when it is itself a most complex organization devised by innumerable trained minds.

Let us here give an example of the closing of the ranks where no immediate threat to property was concerned; only a general shaking of an idea of

crime and punishment. Select the case of Tom Osborne. People will accept a true and reasonable idea if it is merely in a book, even if it is in the New Testament. It is only taking a spiritual idea seriously, attempting to live it, that infuriates them. Mr. Osborne made no over-violent demand on moral faith. His record at Sing Sing he was glad to have tested not by hope but by the results as they appeared actually on the books. Yet what limitless, unclean lies were concocted to fight him with. "Blessed are ye when men shall persecute ye." I went up to this heroic figure one day, when the calumnies against him were at their height, and said: "Well, Mr. Osborne, it is not much fun trying to practice a little Christianity on week days."

"And," he answered, "the text, if interpreted reasonably, is so simple. 'Resist not evil.' What does it mean? Certainly not that we are to acquiesce in evil. It means that the way to remove it is not to go at it with violence. The true method is to plant wholesome growths, by which the harmful ones may be driven out."

When Tom Osborne served his term in prison, in order justly to know, a modern saga was enacted before us. Here was no hypocrisy. Here was a man. He could not stand against the angry herd. He was compelled, for his virtue alone, to leave Sing Sing. And when he enlisted in the regular

navy, in order to carry on his work, the attacks of the stand-pat wolves knew no cease, and his resignation was not long delayed.

I now choose an illustration of a different type. Probably as we look over the desolation of some of the belligerents in the great war, and the disintegration and debts even of the victors, there will be found few who will deny the thesis that modern war is unprofitable even to the victors. Such was the thesis of Norman Angell's famous book. What gave to the author his semi-criminal reputation was perhaps less the theme of the book than what seemed to many to be legible between the lines; that as war could not possibly pay it would not be waged. Many patriots, in England and America, dislike Treitschke and all other extreme militarist philosophy much less than they do this book. "The Great Illusion" has meant much to the youth of the world, through its spirit, and much to leading liberals through its extraordinary powers of analysis and historic illustration. It is one of the most contributive books of our time: one of those volumes that, with better luck, might have helped us avoid the world-war. It has been translated into German, French, Italian, Russian, Chinese, Japanese, Spanish, Dutch, Danish, Swedish, and several languages of the Indian Empire. It has been a text book for the intellectually fearless among the world's youth,

yet to the well-dressed, red-blooded denizens of this world, Norman Angell's name stands for some kind of weak sentiment. I was lunching, in 1917, with two of the most distinguished statesmen in the world, one of them a rising hope of enlightened minds. When the course of talk permitted, I said: "I think you English make a mistake in confusing Norman Angell with mere theoretical pacifists. You are refusing him a passport to go back to America, and yet he has done more than any other Englishman to make it possible for America to enter the war on your side. He is showing to the thinking element, which includes some of the governing element, how we can enter the war on principles consistent with our American ideals. You have noticed, of course, that a speech by the President last June spoke of this war as the last in which we could remain isolated. That paragraph was exactly in Angell's expression. It is an entering wedge of the utmost importance. And yet you now keep him away from us."

What was their answer? "That may be true, but he has made some very foolish statements."

The "statements" were headlines in the newspapers.

Where distinct opposition to enlistment can be traced, persecution comes more within the limits of that falsity to ideals of freedom which the very act

of war makes necessary. The British were fairly tolerant with Bertrand Russell. At first they merely refused to give him a passport, that he might lecture at Harvard University. That is not surprising, for Kerenski was not allowed to present his case (which included opposition to intervention) in America, though the opinion-factory in favor of intervention and blockade was not only allowed but subsidized. Many were arrested or deported for radical propaganda, but none, so far as I know, for reactionary propaganda. In Russell's case his inability to carry his intellectual poison by word of mouth across the Atlantic, to corrupt our idealistic land, was of minor importance, because his books were not forbidden; and for many years, in our country as in Britain, those comprehensive, searching, and calm exposures of what is, with brilliant suggestions of what should be, will continue to do their undermining work. To me it is a certain satisfaction that when Mr. Russell kept on expounding the truth, he was absolutely imprisoned. It gives a medieval thoroughness to the story. Perhaps Mr. Russell presents the moral problem of our age with more grasp than any other living essayist. Unmistakably his essays tend to stiffen the fiber and develop the higher nature. That his arrest became necessary, therefore, is to the comic sense delicious. However we are to credit England with

his return, after his imprisonment, to Cambridge University.

During the war there was one year, 1918, that I spent in America, endeavoring in the columns of Leslie's Weekly to see what I could do to establish common ground with business men, and otherwise busying myself, part of the time in a small town, where my gardener belonged to a sect that is pacifist as an article of faith. He was far beyond military age, but he was suspected of corrupting the young, so he kept rather quiet. Once, tempted by an irreverent remark of my own, he ventured on a question:

"Suppose Tolstoy had been alive in this war," he asked, "what position would he have taken?"

"That is easy," I replied. "He would have been a conscientious objector. They would have gotten him unless his social and intellectual standing had protected him."

The old gardener hesitated. "How about Jesus Christ?" he inquired.

I am afraid I smiled. "You do not expect people to take the Sermon on the Mount seriously in practical affairs, I hope."

One of my more radical friends, whose mind I have seen at work from the time, over twenty years ago, when he was the most vivid reporter in New York, down to his present more evangelic stage, is

Lincoln Steffens, another man who was driven away from the liberals because of what he deemed their powerlessness and the steadfastness of the stand-patriots, patrioteers, or whatever name is loved by those who sleeplessly guard the trough. Referring to one of my own many little skirmishes with this group, Steffens wrote: "We shall have no quarrel on revolutions. I have seen some. I am against them, as I am against war and all the other unnecessary inconveniences of this life. I do not any more directly oppose them, however. My theory is that they will occur again and again until we learn to deal indirectly, but scientifically, with the causes of them. And my further thought is that, if we, the governing class, will not so manhandle the forces which make for evil, the governed class will. And when the mob tackles its own problem, it will act in its own spirit and its own rough way, regardless of the canons of our good taste. In other words, if you are for evolution, show us evolution. I can't see any evolutionists at work. Your own experience is in point. The U. S. Senate does not want the class war, but it is forcing liberals to abandon liberalism and take sides either with the reactionaries or with Labor and the radicals. You have tried to stand between. The Senate won't let you. And the Bolsheviks won't let you. It is a literal case of both ends against the middle." I wrote Steffens further

explaining that I wished there was a reform party in America broad enough to hold him, certain careful reformers, whom I selected as the type of sane radicals, and myself. He replied that he did not think that as a fact a party could be formed that was broad enough to include these forces.

Before our liberals can make even a partial answer to men like Steffens, or indeed to men of the school of Lenin or Karl Marx, we must clear the decks by treating the follies of our thought as pitilessly as they can be treated by any socialist or anarchist. We must not say to them that the evils they cry against do not exist. We must demonstrate that a surer cure exists, slower, but with no patent-medicine quicksands of haste and false promise.

CHAPTER III

WHAT THE ISSUES ARE

A. NATIONALISM

"These unspeakably stupid and contemptible local antipathies are inherited by civilized men from that far-off time when the clan system prevailed over the face of the earth, and the hand of every clan was raised against its neighbors. They are pale and evanescent survivals from the universal primitive warfare, and the sooner they die out from human society, the better for every one."

John Fiske.

THERE are of course before us many minor issues, which arise and disappear. There are two great issues which will be predominant for a long time. Our attitude on these two great issues determines whether we belong among the revolutionaries or "radicals," among the liberals or among the conservatives. These issues are, first, the relations that ought to exist between different classes, and second, the relations that ought to exist between different nations. In the class issue the radicals are the socialists, the liberals are those who seek the purification and supplementing of the

system of private property, and the conservatives are those who want to retain the present feudal system in industry and property. In relations between the nations the radicals are those who believe in complete internationalism, or in lack of any government, like the philosophic anarchists, the liberals are those who believe in national differences and feelings but in close coöperation among the nations and in great tolerance toward different methods of growth, and the conservatives are those who use patriotism as an expression of parochial distrust and those also who want to impose our ideals by force on others. In general the conservatives in industry belong to the second of the two classes of conservatives in foreign affairs. To the first class of conservatives in foreign affairs, the parochials, you find belonging many who in domestic matters are liberals, and this applies especially to people who live in the west and have for a long time given lively attention to domestic problems but know nothing whatever about international matters and therefore view them with rustic distrust. Senator Borah and Senator Johnson are examples of these. Of the second class of conservatives in foreign affairs an example are those who would take satisfaction in introducing "order" into Mexico and incidentally absorbing her most valuable properties, and to this class belong the majority of those who find complete satisfaction in

the system by which one man, or a group of ignorant stockholders, dispose completely of the destinies of all the men and women who work in a factory. General Wood seems to be an example. As this book deals with the question of what is progress to-day it has to do mainly with these two different but psychologically related sets of questions. It is to be hoped that the issues of our political campaigns will be centered more and more on them. The foreign group of questions, finding its center in the Peace Treaty and the League of Nations, cannot be solved automatically. It can have the most favorable outcome only if the minds of the voters are kept steadily on international affairs. An absolute essential of progressive thinking along this line lies in better news service and in a lessening of the deadening propaganda of the governments that have been exercising censorships for several years. The industrial question is sure to be kept sharply before us. In that question what we need to pray for is an open mind, lack of fear, and an unselfish spirit.

The make-believe issues of our meaningless party divisions do harm and obstruct the attention given to the real issues. Let me give as an illustration the conduct of the majority leader in the United States Senate at a moment in the world's history when nothing less was involved than the life of European civilization. Most of us believe in party govern-

ment, but there is great danger in partisan littleness. No one will pretend that President Wilson has been tactful with the Republicans, but he has been creative and devoted, and those who have lowered their standard of world-relations in order either to punish him or to maintain their own power have committed a crime much worse than those on the statute books. Before the President took up the leadership of the League of Nations work Senator Lodge expressed himself with fervor in support of it. On May 26, 1916, at Washington, under the auspices of the League to Enforce Peace, he said:

"It was a year ago that in delivering the Chancellor's address at Union College I made an argument on this theory: that if we were to promote international peace at the close of the present terrible war, if we were to restore international law as it must be restored, we must find some way in which the united forces of the nations could be put behind the cause of peace and law. I said then that my hearers might think I was picturing a Utopia, but it is in the search for Utopias that great discoveries have been made. 'Not failure, but low aim is the crime.' This league certainly has the highest of all aims for the benefit of humanity, and because the pathway is sown with difficulties is no reason that we should turn from it. It is the vision of a perhaps impossible perfection which has led humanity

across the centuries. If our aspirations are for that which is great and beautiful and good and beneficent to humanity, even when we do not achieve our end, even if the results are little, we can at least remember Arnold's lines:

> 'Charge again, then, and be dumb.
> Let the victors, when they come,
> When the forts of folly fall,
> Find your body at the wall.' "

Comparing the tone then with much of the Senator's language after partisanship was introduced into the question shows how much the ideal is lowered in the heat of party politics. Senator Lodge's manner of talking about our responsibilities abroad underwent a complete change of emphasis. He no longer asked us to be generous and fearless, in a wholly necessary enterprise to save the world from destruction. He said: "The hearts of the vast majority of mankind would beat on strongly and without any quickening if the League were to perish altogether." He began to sneer at such things, to talk about being an American and nothing but an American, in the cheap vein of pseudo-patriotism, until one would suppose that the vast credit of being born in the United States was enough to free a person from the exercise of any other virtue. By this kind of vain and obstructive patriotism Gilbert's lines are inevitably brought to mind:

"For he himself has said it!
And it's greatly to his credit,
That he is an Englishman!
That he is an Englishman!
For he might have been a Rooshun,
A French, or Turk, or Prooshun,
Or perhaps Italian,
Or perhaps Italian.
But in spite of all temptations
To belong to other nations,
He remains an Englishman!"

Lodge's version of it is this: "An American I was born, an American I have remained all my life. I can never be anything else but American. * * * I have never had but one allegiance—I cannot divide it now. I have loved but one flag and I cannot share that devotion and give affection to the mongrel banner invented for a League. * * * National I must remain . . ."

The perils of internationalism are nothing compared to the perils of this kind of nationalism. With class-narrowness it forms our gravest menace, and the danger it presents is greater than is offered by the class-conflict, since a highly organized war to the death between classes is far less probable than such a war between the nations. It was false nationalism that brought on this war. It is false nationalism that will bring on the next war. Our way of treating Mexico or South America is import-

in itself, but still more important is the mood it encourages, the traditions and ideals it creates, for by such moods, traditions, and ideals the next world-war will be created or avoided. Moreover, the class-conflict, however regrettable in some of its forms, is a struggle toward industrial justice, and therefore has its great creative rôle in history; whereas the nationalism of distrust offers us nothing but barbarism. There is an Americanism that has its meaning, but this is not it.

The two preceding chapters have hinted that some of the obstacles to fair understanding between nations are artificially built up. The fear that we have of hearing both sides of important questions is one of the most extraordinary attributes of man. One would suppose, for example, that when the great war was ended our statesmen and leaders generally would have welcomed all the historical knowledge obtainable, including documents showing the points of view of the various elements in Germany. A normal desire to get the attitude of General Ludendorff did credit to the newspaper readers of this country, and his account of the war as he saw it was successfully syndicated. Now look at our statesmen. You can find their brand of patriotism in the Congressional Record for September 28, 1919:

Mr. Chamberlain: "Can it be that his propa-

ganda is to be disseminated in the United States through the instrumentality of a so-called history of the war or story of the war? Are the American people to be educated from the German standpoint and to have the German theory of the reason for the war, Germany's innocence in its instigation, its harmless carrying on of the war, through the instrumentality of the story of this man?

Mr. Lodge: Is it proposed to publish serially or in any other way such a thing as that?

Mr. Chamberlain: Absolutely. If the Senator will observe some of the newspapers he will find that they are promising now to publish in the near future the so-called Ludendorff story of the war.

Mr. Lodge: I trust it will not be done.

Mr. Chamberlain: I am just expressing that hope, and I am glad to have the Senator join with me. . . .

"Mr. President, America has over 200,000 casualties as a result of the war. Not only are her hospitals filled with boys who have been maimed by the cruel processes of German warfare, but the asylums as well are filled in some instances with young men who were shell-shocked or otherwise disabled by the system of warfare waged under Ludendorff's direction. The American people have learned who are the authors of this war. They know

it was the settled plan of the militarists of Germany to become involved in it and to wage it. They know that it was their purpose in the last analysis to make America assist in the payment for the war, if current and contemporaneous history is to be believed. Notwithstanding that belief and knowledge, are we to have this friend of the reportorial system of Europe introduce his methods into this country and slyly instill into the American people not only that Germany was innocent of instituting the war but that the German methods were kindly and its purposes lofty?

"I for one, Mr. President, hope that the newspapers of the country, and I am glad to say that practically all of them were patriotic and loyal in the war, will without any action upon the part of Congress, but simply inspired by the same motives of patriotism which animated them during the war, decline absolutely to print this story of the war by the man who was the reputed military leader and who is so largely responsible for German cruelty and brutality.

"I call attention of the Congress to this matter, Mr. President, in the hope that, if this story is to be printed, there may be some public expression about the author of this so-called history of the war, so that people may be warned in advance to read it with caution as a part of the system of German

propaganda, deliberately planned to poison the minds of the American people, and of the fathers and mothers, wives and sweethearts of our heroic dead."

Mr. Chamberlain explained that he knew little about Ludendorff himself, but that he had read in "Current Opinion" that he was a bad man. Now Mr. Chamberlain as Governor of Oregon had a progressive record. He represents perfectly the well-meaning parochial mind afraid of the unknown, afraid even to have the American people know what the German militaristic standpoint really was. In his opinion it would be far safer to protect our people from such soul-destroying knowledge and simply tell them in words of one syllable what their conclusions ought to be.

The liberal attitude toward foreign affairs must be aggressively maintained, if liberalism is to do its work, and one of its outstanding principles will be that full knowledge of other peoples must be encouraged. Instead of dividing nations into our friends and our enemies we should put all possible emphasis on sympathetic comprehension of all. No one sentence is more misused than the one about entangling alliance in Washington's Farewell Address. Entangling in what? Washington was talking about pressing realities, not about anything that happened a century earlier or might happen

a century later. He had had great difficulty in keeping his countrymen from getting into a meaningless second war with England merely as a result of lingering hostility to that country and lingering partisanship for France. He was talking to a weak nation that was not considering going into any league of nations, but was in danger of being dragged into a fight for control between the two dominant nations of Europe. He was facing the spirit Senator Lodge expresses to-day when he declaims "we owe no debt to any one except to France." Moreover this little nation was absolutely removed from all the concerns of Europe, and we do small honor to Washington's mind to suppose he would have taken no account of steam, the telegraph, the wireless, modern trade, the change from a little group of colonists in a wilderness to a most powerful nation that had just emerged from participation in a world-war, and was considering whether it would participate in an attempt at preventing another. A far closer analogy to our own problem was presented to Washington when he took part in the controversy over the constitution, or as it was then often called, the treaty between the thirteen states. The arguments brought forward to show that a combination among the states would mean danger, oppression and disaster were ridiculously like those brought against the League of Na-

tions by its opponents in the Senate and the press. Mr. Charles P. Howland has brought together some of these similarities in a way that is at once amusing and instructive. Here are examples:

In the New York Convention of 1788 a speaker objected to union "because I think it is morally certain that this new Government will be administered by the wealthy." In Massachusetts Mr. Singletary said: "These lawyers and men of learning and monied men, that talk so finely and gloss over matters so smoothly, to make us poor illiterate people swallow down the pill, expect to get into Congress themselves; they expect to be the managers of this Constitution and to get all the power and all the money into their own hands, and then they will swallow up all us little folks, like the great Leviathan, Mr. President, yes, just as the whale swallowed up Jonah."

In our own day Mr. Borah of Idaho says: "If the Democratic party and the Republican party have passed under the grip and control of the international bankers of New York, who are financing the League to Enforce Peace, and sending out hundreds and thousands of speakers and flooding the land with propaganda in favor of the League of Nations—if both parties have passed under their control—there will be another party which will represent the American people."

As we now seek scares over control of our interests by the common voice, so Mr. Lowndes of South Carolina said: "The interest of the Northern States would so predominate as to divest us of any pretensions to the title of Republic." Patrick Henry declared: "This government subjects everything to the Northern majority. We thus put unbounded power over our property in hands not having a common interest with us * * * Sir, this is a picture so horrid, so wretched, so dreadful, that I need no longer dwell upon it." Our own Senator Sherman of Illinois comes along with this: "I regard it as a new sovereign power proposed, assuming to assert dominion over governments and nations, to sit in judgment on the American people, and frame new laws to order their lives and seize their property. Its decrees, if effective, bind the United States Government, abrogate its Constitution, and rule our people by laws made in Geneva, Switzerland." The opponents of Washington had their own "Geneva, Switzerland." "Is this, sir," said Mr. Tredwell of New York, "a government for freemen? Are we thus to be duped of our liberties? * * * We ought, sir, to consider that we may now give away by a vote what it may cost the dying groans of thousands to recover; that we may now surrender with a little ink what it may cost seas of blood to regain; the dagger of ambition

is now pointed at the fair bosom of liberty and to deepen and complete the tragedy, we, her sons, are called upon to give the fatal thrust."

How like Senator Johnson of California: "No group of men sitting in Washington will keep the Treaty out of the campaign. How futile it is for those men to insist that the American flag shall be buried and ask the American people to walk over its grave."

Related, of course, to "Geneva, Switzerland," is "delegating power." Mr. Smith said in the New York Convention: "Can the liberties of three millions of people be securely trusted in the hands of three men? Is it prudent to commit to so small a number the decision of the great questions which will come before them? Reason revolts at the idea." Mr. Wadsworth of New York now says: "Has the time come when the people of the United States are ready to rely upon the judgment of one man, sitting at the capital of Switzerland, who, by his vote, may pledge support of the people of the United States to an undertaking with which they are utterly unfamiliar?"

There is the fear of giving more than we receive. Mr. Grayson of Virginia said: "What is the situation of Virginia? She is rich with her resources as compared with those of others. Is it right for a rich nation to consolidate with a poor one? What

does she get in return? I can see what she gives up, which is immense. The little states gain in proportion as we lose. Every disproportion is against us." The modern equivalent is Senator Reed: "The American people and the American Government have nearly all they can attend to at home without spreading themselves out over the world and trying to take care of all the good Lord's creation."

The less the orator knows the more eloquent and alarmed his tone, and Washington will soon hint for us a similar difficulty in his time.

"Ambiguity" has been almost the favorite charge against the League. "If we adopt this Constitution," protested Mr. Williams of New York in 1788, "it is impossible, absolutely impossible, to know what we give up, and what we retain." Senator Brandegee of Connecticut calls the treaty "this muddy, murky and muddled document of international entanglements and embarrassments."

Mandates and similar bogies had their counterpart in Washington's day. George Mason "apprehended the possibility of Congress calling in the militia of Georgia to quell disturbances in New Hampshire." In our day Illinois comes out strong to defend us against this danger. One of her senators, Mr. Sherman, says: "Hereafter, if we answer the President's call, mothers will but cradle their sons to fill the muster rolls of armies to give

their lives in foreign service. We must spend our substance, it is further insisted, to resurrect and redeem people stunted by racial fault and vices and schooled for generations in chronic revolts and general insubordination against the tranquillity of peaceful life." The other Senator from Illinois, Mr. McCormick, is not less careful: "Our young men will go forth to defend cities of which they never heard. In the high places of Asia, the snow will cover the frozen bodies of Americans, perhaps now unborn, and American mothers—little girls of to-day, mayhap, playing in the summer air about the dooryards—will mourn their sons fallen in the desert wastes of Syria and Egypt."

Cannot John Fiske, whom I have quoted at the head of this chapter, be called in to sum up not only the smaller fears and jealousies of that day, but the equally obstructive and blind arguments against world coöperation to-day?

Now to this problem, so analogous in its psychology, and truly also in its essence, to our foreign problem of to-day, what was the response of the father of his country? He was by unanimous consent president of the Assembly that adopted the Constitution. On August 19, 1797, he wrote to Knox: "I am fully persuaded it is the best that can be obtained at the present moment under such a diversity of ideas as prevail." On September 24,

1787, he wrote to Patrick Henry: "I wish the Constitution, which is offered, had been made more perfect; but I sincerely believe it is the best that could be obtained at this time. And, as a constitutional door is opened for amendment hereafter, our adoption of it, under the present circumstances of the Union, is in my opinion desirable."

He had little respect for the opposition. It existed largely, he thought, "because the importance and sinister views of too many characters will be affected by the change." Of the opponents of the Constitution he said: "The major part of them will, it is to be feared, be governed by sinister and self important motives." Again of the opponents he wrote to Hamilton: "Some of whom, it is said, by overshooting the marks, have lessened their weight. Be this as it may, their assiduity stands unrivalled."

Of the objections put forward he wrote to David Stuart: "I have hardly seen one, that was not addressed to the passions of the people, and obviously calculated to alarm their fears."

To Edmund Randolph he wrote that if he had ever had any belief that amendments before trial could be obtained and result in improvement he had been cured of that belief by the kind of arguments put forward. Can we not warm to that statement to-day? Washington wrote to John Arm-

strong, April 25, 1788: "That the proposed Constitution will admit of amendments is acknowledged by its warmest advocates; but to make such amendments as may be proposed the condition of its adoption would, in my opinion, amount to a complete rejection of it. . . . The truth is, men are too apt to be swayed by local prejudices."

On August 31, 1788, he wrote to Jefferson: "For myself I was ready to embrace any tolerable compromise, that was competent to save us from impending ruin."

I should like particularly to ask Americans to translate the following words of Washington to Knox, October, 1787, into terms of to-day:

"1. Is the Constitution, which is submitted by the Convention, preferable to the government (if it can be called one) under which we now live?

"2. Is it probable that more confidence would at the time be placed in another Convention, provided the experiment should be tried, than was placed in the last one, and is it likely that a better agreement would take place therein? What would be the consequence if these should not happen, or even from the delay, which must inevitably follow such an experiment? Is there not a constitutional door open for alterations or amendments? And is it not likely that real defects will be as readily discovered after as before trial? And will not our

successors be as ready to apply the remedy as ourselves, if occasion should require it? To think otherwise will, in my judgment, be ascribing more of the *amor patriæ,* more wisdom and more virtue to ourselves than I think we deserve."

What closer parallel could be expected to the reasons put forth by President Wilson, except that President Wilson was less willing to accept compromise and claimed more excellence, or seemed to, for the Peace Treaty and the League than Washington claimed for the Constitution of the United States? But I think what was in Mr. Wilson's head, if not in his words, was the same thing that was in Washington's. Mr. Wilson believed the treaty good because it was as good as the powers were likely then to agree to, and because it could be amended: not to be sure as easily as it ought to be amended; but if it is successful in action one of the early steps will probably be to make amendment easier.

Woodrow Wilson's insight was deep when it told him that if he could bring about a machinery by which nations should consult, he would be doing the greatest service that any statesman could render. He was right in principle, whatever may be true of method and detail, when he fought against amendments in advance of trial, and against reservations, which in practice meant the attempt to give

to the United States a position of special favor. He was right when he sought to make the League machinery as strong and definite as possible, in order that it might not become a mere Hague tribunal. He was right when he saw in the possibility of another world-war the dominant issue of our time, as Washington after the revolution saw the greatest danger in differences among the states.

Looking at this great question of international coöperation in a broad and competent spirit, there is only one objection of first-class importance that can be made to the point of view I have been supporting. It is that the League might, if the machinery were not right, become a League of conservation and imperialism, like the Holy Alliance. This is what has been in the minds of the most intelligent among those who have made such a fight against the difficulty of amendment, and against Article X, as they interpret that article. It is a real danger, but it is a danger that can be met in only one way, as the President has fully realized. It can be met only by the election of advanced liberal legislatures and executives. Without that step there can be no safety. Without meeting that responsibility democracy can never be safe.

B. THE CLASS CONFLICT

"So distribution should undo excess
And each man have enough."

"King Lear."

"I do not mean to suggest that the means by which the Russians overthrew first Czardom and then Kerenski are at all the means by which the British will escape from a very different régime. I only say that oil and water will not mix, and that substantial uniformity of class-structure is essential to a League of Commonwealths. If this is so, the social question is the question which above all others demands an answer."

G. D. H. Cole.

For the desirable issue of the conflict between the classes the outlook is much more promising than is the outlook for preventing further conflicts between the nations. This better outlook grows mainly out of the fact that people are interested in the industrial question. They are compelled to be interested. It is not something remote, like the next war, but something that they have to deal with in daily business, in daily housekeeping. However unlike in certain habits, the employer and the laborer, the mistress and the maid, speak usually a common language, through which they get a certain amount of information and thought across to one another.

The class-conflict has taken a long step in advance recently because of the single fact that it has come to be generally recognized that there is something to fight about. It has now become almost a joke, except among patriotic and frightened orators, to speak of this as the best of all possible worlds. We know now that it is full of evil that can be and ought to be removed. There are hidebound conservatives left but they are comic figures, and the conflict has been shifted to the best means of bringing about what the overwhelming majority of rational persons know must be brought about. The war put us backwards, in some respects, in the consideration of this question, but on the whole it greatly put us forward. Bertrand Russell was sent to jail for six months for saying that the American Army at home is accustomed to intimidating strikers, but on the other hand more and more of us realize that the army, the legislatures, and the courts have not been, on the whole, used in an attempt to seek disinterested justice but rather to reassure and protect those who occupy the pleasant positions. The fuller realization of the elements of the situation, by all classes, takes us a good distance on the road toward proper solutions. Those solutions of the social and industrial questions will also not improbably be the only roads to the final satisfactory solution of international questions, since it is extremely probable that the right

handling of international relations is impossible for the present type of class governments, whose prejudices, fears, and imagined interests prevent free thought and free experiment. Although, therefore, of all the questions now confronting liberalism the foreign group is the most menacing, the industrial group in the last analysis offers the final answers.

Ten and fifteen years ago, in the halcyon days of "muck-raking," the task of the liberal was to shock the complacent bourgeois into a realization that not everything was right with the world. Theodore Roosevelt was the greatest of that reforming group in his ability to reach the popular mind and heart. Intellectually, creatively, expertly the greatest, I think, without question was Mr. Brandeis. It was to a friend of mine that Bill Haywood once said: "Brandeis is the most dangerous man in the United States." If we follow that anecdote back to its origin and meaning we shall find in concrete form the world-wide issue of to-day: which path are we going to take to industrial reform? Haywood's remark was made at a time when there was a most difficult situation in the garment-making industry in New York. The conditions of employment in that industry are about as bad as they could be. The work is seasonal, with an extraordinary amount of involuntary unemployment. The labor is shifting and poorly educated. It is just the situation to make

strikes easy and permanent satisfactory solutions difficult. Mr. Brandeis worked out a plan showing such knowledge of the business, of the needs of capital, and of the psychology of labor that it was on all sides looked upon as an amazing triumph of constructive thinking. To describe the whole protocol would not fall within the scope of this book, but I may take as an illustration of the complex solution the brilliant method of meeting the old difficulty between the closed and the open shop. There were evils in both open and closed shops. The closed shop was potentially despotic. It could be used as a weapon of coercion even when labor on a specific dispute was wrong. The open-shop was little more than a polite term for the fight against collective bargaining—collective, that is to say, on the labor end. In the preferential union shop union men were to be given the preference in employment, but if at any time the unions failed to furnish the requisite number of suitable men the employer was free to employ non-union men, with this condition, however, that he could not employ them on terms in any respect worse than those won by the unions. A difference between the whole protocol, of which this idea was a detail, and other innovations by Mr. Brandeis, is that the others, once started, ran independent of his personality, whereas this agreement suffered greatly when he ceased to be able to help

carry it out in practice. But Haywood's comment was just, and might have been made of almost any other of Mr. Brandeis's contributions to our stock of exact ideas about how to usher in the new industrial era. What Haywood meant was that Mr. Brandeis was the most dangerous to the I. W. W. He was most dangerous to the philosophy that there is no hope in evolution, and that therefore the eyes of the laboring class must be fixed on revolution. That is the question that we cannot escape. Are we to welcome, to think out with all our power, sound steps, always in the direction of more democracy in industry; or are we to rely on stubborn opposition? Mr. Haywood was putting in personal form the view of the revolutionary agitator. Haywood is not afraid of Senator Penrose, Senator Smoot, Senator Lodge, Senator Knox, or of the masters of these men, from Judge Gary down. He knows that if the tone of the capitalist class is set by such minds, capitalism is doomed. To him the dangerous man is he who can make private capital a satisfactory institution.

One objection will here be made by thinking people. An argument will run something like this: "If it is true that extreme radicals see the most permanent danger to their theories in the success of liberalism, why do not they more often oppose liberal measures? Why do they often support them?"

The question is a fair one. There is a very large body of extremists who refuse to have anything whatever to do with liberalism or any form of parliamentarism. Such are the great syndicalist bodies of France, and such is the I. W. W. in America. There has always been a sharp division in the Socialist party on the question. It was normal for the British Fabian socialists to go into the British Labor Party: in their very name lies the explanation. It is natural, on the other hand, for the British Labor Party to refuse the degree of coöperation offered to it in elections by the Liberal Party, because it believes that the British Liberal Party is too vague for the times, and that the Labor Party is the real liberal party in relation to the problems of our day. The British Labor Party is the most promising existing political party in the world because in it are found combined the elements that here are scattered: elements like the most progressive among those who followed Mr. Roosevelt, the most progressive among those who followed Mr. Wilson, the ablest labor leaders, and the exceptional and constructive individual thinkers. In the United States a constructive liberal is strongly impelled to work outside of party machinery. In England, after decades of preparatory thought and effort, appropriate machinery was prepared for him when in 1917 the most active forward thought of the na-

tion combined into one party. To explain Haywood further, I might put his view like this: If there were a thousand men equal to Mr. Brandeis in the United States, there could be no doubt that we should find methods to introduce industrial democracy without ever giving the apostles of violence a possibility of attaining power. But to overemphasize genius is unfair. It is the general spirit that is most important, and if we were right in spirit we should develop leaders enough. If business, the bar, the bench, the clergy, and the universities were led by liberals revolution could have no meaning other than evolution.

I believe that nobody can be an effective liberal to-day and not sympathize with the objects of labor as conservatively set forth by Mr. Henderson:

"In the field of national finance the Labour Party stands for a system of taxation regulated not by the interests of possessing and profiteering classes, but by the claims of the professional and housekeeping classes, whose interests are identical with those of the manual workers. We believe that indirect taxation upon commodities should not fall upon any necessity of life, but should be limited to luxuries, especially and principally those which it is socially desirable to extinguish. Direct taxation, we hold, upon large incomes and private fortunes is the method by which the greater part of the necessary

revenue should be raised; we advocate the retention in some appropriate form of the excess profits tax; and we shall oppose every attempt to place upon the shoulders of the producing classes, the professional classes, and the small traders, the main financial burden of the war. We seek to prevent, by methods of common ownership and of taxation, the accumulation of great fortunes in private hands. Instead of senseless individual extravagances we desire to see the wealth of the nation expended for social purposes—for the constant improvement and increase of the nation's enterprises, to make provision for the sick, the aged, and the infirm, to establish a genuine national system of education, to provide the means of public improvements in all directions by which the happiness and health of the people will be ensured."

That is the spirit of labor that capital must cordially coöperate with, if its successful operation is not to be rendered impossible by the followers of Haywood and Lenin. Mr. Henderson wrote while the war was still being waged, but as in the United States the most incredible interferences with liberty have come since the war ended we may well notice the close connection Mr. Henderson traces between the labor program and the right to freedom. He says:

"The military censorship has developed into a

wonderful political engine which enable the authorities systematically to control the press. It enables the executive not merely to control opinion but to manufacture it. On the one hand it prevents free discussion of questions of public policy; on the other it guides the public mind by means of a steady stream of artful suggestion and official 'information' manipulated and colored in accordance with official views. The seizure of pamphlets, the suppression of newspapers, the attempt to bring under the survey of the censorship every leaflet, pamphlet, and printed sheet dealing however remotely with questions of war and peace, are only additional illustrations of this dangerous development by which truth is rationed, political opinion made to order in government factories, and an artificial unity by the simple expedient of denying expression to dissident views. The practical denial of free speech and the right of the public meeting, both by direct prohibition and by the far worse method of permitting meetings to be broken up by organized violence, is another development against which democracy is bound to protest. Still more sinister is the growth of espionage and police inquisition: the adoption of continental methods of surveillance represents an invasion of private life by the agents of authority which before the war one

would have confidently declared this country would never tolerate."

In the years ahead of us, in which the respective right of different industrial classes will be, under many disguises, the actual pressing issue, it will be impossible for us to march with any confidence toward the inevitable new civilization unless we are allowed to maintain the best British and American traditions of free information, free thought, and free speech. But these words are written while the legislature of the Empire State is expelling some of its members for belonging to a party holding opinions with which the majority of the New York legislature does not agree. Six years ago we could not have believed such a thing possible in a so-called free country.

CHAPTER IV

WITHOUT A PARTY

"The masters of the Government of the United States are the combined manufacturers of the United States."

Woodrow Wilson.

"The survival in the United States of two parties, two 'machines,' which differ very little in their programs, and which are both made up of elements absolutely heterogeneous."

Emile Vandervelde.

IN April of this year one of my most intelligent Russian friends asked me what position I expected to take in the approaching campaign. "Assuming," I replied, "that the President will not be a candidate there are only two men now in the field whom I could support. Others may come to the front before June, but the principle will remain the same. The man must measure up to the requirements. That is more important than the platform. At present only two such men are prominent. If neither of them is nominated, and if no unexpected candidate appears, I shall either vote a third-party ticket, in a general effort to strengthen the left, or remain at home and read a novel."

My friend was amazed. "Nobody in Europe," he said, "would understand a speech like that. Parties with us mean too much to be taken in that way."

"Certainly they do," I replied. "But in this country they do not."

Of course my statement about staying at home on election day was not literal. There is always some issue. A good deal has happened in America in the two months that have elapsed between that conversation and the day, just before the Republican nomination, when I write these particular sentences. Nothing has happened, however, or is likely soon to happen, affecting the idea I was explaining to my foreign friend about the relative lack of meaning and lack of responsibility in our parties to-day.

If Mr. Wilson's statement, put at the head of this chapter, is correct, we shall not be surprised to find that there are no essential living issues dividing our two great parties. Certain it is that they are not divided along the lines of the two great groups of contemporary problems, outlined in the last chapter. Therefore for a person who lives in real issues there is in the United States no place politically for him to go with satisfaction to his mind. The parties express little more than the impulse of contest. Party spirit exists shorn of principle, and the excesses of partisanship are thereby

increased, whereas constructive coöperation is decreased. The grade of mind that is found in office is lower than it would be if great issues divided the parties, as in the days of Hamilton and Jefferson, Webster and Calhoun, Lincoln and Douglas. Even in the days of McKinley and Cleveland we thought we had an issue in the incidence of taxation, although it was largely an illusion. We have had to fight, as we saw the opportunity, for general progressiveness of spirit and individual competence, and to prefer men to parties. When, in 1912, in the months preceding the nominations for the presidency, Mr. Charles R. Crane supported both Mr. LaFollette and Mr. Wilson he was showing an attitude, in view of the actual situation, corresponding to the one I have described as my own in the spring of 1920.

In that same campaign of 1912, after the nominations, some important matters were brought to an issue. Later some of them were disposed of. It differed from most other campaigns in that the issues were sharper, and that it therefore did something to clear the air. I have never known a campaign, national or local, in which there was for a long time such a ground-swell of ethical enthusiasm. Persons, especially young persons, who had never taken a genuine interest in politics throbbed with enthusiasm. They believed indeed that they were

at Armageddon, battling for the Lord. But this conviction gradually faltered as the campaign went on. The intellectual foundation was too weak. It was impossible to keep up the ethical fervor while remaining on the defensive on the two outstanding issues of the contest. Mr. Wilson, according to his wont, selected what he deemed the most important matters in sight and confined himself to them. The reactionary Republicans behind Taft were shown up in their impotence. The reactionary Democrats, already beaten at Baltimore, found that in Wilson they had a fighter on their hands, and the Bryan Democrats came to realize that a man could be well-trained, exact, and careful and at the same time radical. The real issue was, which was the more forward party, Roosevelt's or Wilson's, and this had to be tested not by hymns but by measures. The Colonel, with all his energy and resourcefulness, tried various issues, in the attempt to seize the offensive. He believed, with much reason, that if he could once become successfully launched he could start a prairie fire and win. Wilson, however, ignored side issues, stuck to the tariff and the trusts, and thereby kept Roosevelt steadily on the defensive. On the defensive he could not win. As far as I know Mr. McAdoo first used the expression "regulated competition instead of regulated monopoly," but Mr. Brandeis certainly was the one

who worked it out most profoundly in that campaign, and Mr. Wilson kept the idea always in the foreground. Personally I was extremely excited about that particular issue, seeing in it the whole question of what path toward industrial democracy the nation would take in the future, and to that excitement I owe the honor of being selected by the Colonel for a place on the black list. I had been writing persistently on that issue throughout the campaign, as editor of Collier's Weekly. When I left that publication, in October, 1912, the Colonel wrote: "In this campaign the Progressive party has suffered very grave harm through the perpetration of an untruth as to its position on the regulation of trusts. This untruth has been disseminated through two channels, the editorial pages of Collier's Weekly and the speeches of Woodrow Wilson."

Col. Roosevelt believed in size and trusted to Governmental regulation. I believed, on the other hand, that unless we could save the smaller units we must come to state bureaucracy, and was much influenced in this belief by the ablest arguments put out in that campaign on the trust issue, namely those of Mr. Brandeis. That stirring thinker has never lost sight of the importance of size in making our industrial system a technical, intellectual, and moral success. The choice between a wasteful

and oppressive devil-take-the-hindmost point-of-view on the one hand, and on the other a managing bureaucracy, with the individual pigeon-holed, has been a choice he has never been willing to make. His ideal has been the ideal of our forefathers, intelligently adapted to the circumstances of our day. Naturally, therefore, some of his solidest and most expert thinking has been in demonstrating the wastefulness that results from big units, notably when size is attained not by successful growth but by the ability to bribe competitors out of existence. His long contest with the New Haven Railroad had many aspects, but two of his principles stand out as of most permanent importance. One was this unwillingness to see inefficiency succeed through the mere purchasing power of volume. The other was a fine old tradition, that the people of a locality should control their own affairs. The New Haven merger was a threat not only to the efficiency of transit in New England but to the political freedom of New England. Hence Mr. Brandeis's hard fight against that merger. The same philosophy was shown in his earlier work. In the Boston elevated case the idea on which he started to work out his plan was that Boston should retain control of her transportation system. In the practical application of that principle he put the expert study and the business mind that made the final arrangement

a success. There was the same thought in the now famous gas contract. Mr. Brandeis put through an arrangement by which the gas company was allowed to make a certain rate of profit as the price then stood. The quality, of course, was to remain uniform, and every time that the price was reduced by a given amount to the consumer the company was permitted to make a higher profit. This ground-idea, that private enterprise should be allowed to reap liberal rewards for actual benefits to the community, but that the community should be carefully protected against exploitation, has been an outstanding principle with Mr. Brandeis. The over-simplifying conceptions of socialism have been antipathetic to him, as has their belief in big units and high centralization.

I think Colonel Roosevelt never understood the importance of the distinction between these two approaches to the trust issue. His temper was sympathetic to huge forces and central control. Of the two sides of political truth represented by Alexander Hamilton and Thomas Jefferson, he saw only the Hamilton side, as his depreciations of Jefferson sufficiently attest. Not many Americans even today have well-worked-out beliefs about the proper place, in our approaching democracy, of private initiative, central political control, self-government by producers or distributors. This is natural

enough. Our political poetry is still the poetry of the pioneer. Our epic is from the log cabin or the footpath to the White House, from office boy to millionaire. The total indifference to the future, shown by the way in which we controlled our lands, our minerals, our franchises, were our way of rewarding enterprise and vigor. If reaching across the continent to the Pacific Ocean hastily, instead of waiting for a normal growth, was the main desire, the rest followed logically. When I was a boy, something grandiose, noble even, seemed to inhere in the very idea of size. The burlesque toast, "Here's to the United States, bordered on the North by the Aurora Borealis," etc., was not an unfair parody. The hostility to the first faint protests of the less fortunate was confident and decisive. If laboring men desired shorter hours, it was to loaf; if more money, it was to drink; if they sought acts establishing employers' liability, it was to cheat the employer through the workmen's carelessness. If reformers sought to shake the absolute hold of individuals on city water, gas, or traction, they were socialists. If they sought to plan our national land, forest, and mineral policy with an eye to the future, a Joe Cannon could say that posterity might take care of itself.

Mark Hanna's era marked the climax of this easy defiance by the strong. I well remember the

charming, bulldog manner in which Hanna took up the defense of unlimited private monopoly in reply to Mr. Bryan's attacks on the trusts. It was a note that can never be sounded quite so fearlessly again. Even Mr. Gary has to watch a little, to catch the favorable moment, in order to get all of the great organs of established privilege on his side. Even he cannot be as gay as Hanna was.

Surely history will be just to Col. Roosevelt. It will call him the first American of enormous popularity and ability to question the modern industrial system. As the pioneer he naturally, from our present point of view, did not go far. He was not a student of economics, and was unable to present the problem of the twentieth century. But he was a moralist, an educated man, a shrewd politician, and a hero. As far as his mind would carry him clearly, he would proceed with enormous vigor and courage. In proclaiming the application of ordinary morality to politics and business he did a creative work. He established one of the landmarks of American history. Three generations were stirred by him. Men now very old began to feel the thrill when he was only Civil Service Commissioner. Those now in middle life and the beginnings of old age worked for him or against him in the many splendid contests of his Presidency, and the contests, not so splendid, that he carried on when

out of office. Even those now in the twenties have felt the health of his rushing spirit. History will give serious attention to his record from his youth up to 1908. His railroad regulation, his fight to give power to the Interstate Commerce Commission, may look slight to the eyes of 1920, but they were full of meaning when Roosevelt led those movements, and they were education to the country. In other matters, such as the conservation of natural resources, in which he boldly risked his popularity in the West, his views were as advanced as those prevailing in liberal circles to-day. Around him grouped the earnestness and devotion of aspiring American manhood. It was all that was needed then. In certain spots, like Massachusetts, Wisconsin and Oregon, various experiments in government were going on in advance of the national pace, but Roosevelt, in preparing the nation to venture on the application of ideas, was going as fast as the historic conditions called for. The group that followed him can fairly be called the liberal party of America, and while he was in power that group controlled the strongest of our parties. Perhaps, if he had run again in 1908, and won, he would have kept pace with the times. It is hard to say. But that leading the opposition did not help him to formulate liberalism is clear.

At first it seemed as if it might. Mr. Taft, companionable and non-contentious—in Dolliver's saying, "a large, good-natured body, entirely surrounded by men who know exactly what they want" —became an easy victim of the Aldrich, Smoot, Penrose, Lodge ring in the Senate and the Cannon ring in the House. He broke himself hopelessly on the piratic Aldrich bill and the Ballinger misadventure; that is to say, on tariff privileges and natural resources privileges. By the winter of 1911-12, Mr. Taft had so entirely disappointed the Roosevelt wing of the party that the Colonel decided to run again, as he certainly could not have done if Mr. Taft's record had been liberal. I had been a follower of the Colonel, on the whole, for a dozen years, and had become attached to him, as practically all of his followers were attached, by his ardor, courage, charm, and frequent bursts of genius. Therefore when the parting of the ways presented itself to me it was in the nature of a tragedy. There was no danger of my having to leave my party, for I had never had any party. It was a question of changing leaders. It was a question of deciding whether or not Theodore Roosevelt still represented the forward movement in America. This was in the winter or early spring of 1912, but I had already made up my mind that Wilson would be nominated. It was in the

Colonel's home at Oyster Bay, where I was spending the night.

"Suppose," Mr. Roosevelt said suddenly, "that I am nominated by the Republicans in June, and Wilson by the Democrats; whom will you support?"

The situation was difficult, but the answer was easy. "If the Republicans take a progressive stand by nominating you, and the Democrats take a progressive stand by nominating Wilson, my decision will be made on the platform, and primarily on those planks which deal with the tariff and the trusts."

The Colonel was silent. The tariff and the trusts were not his natural fighting ground. He missed the nomination by a hair, bolted, and formed the Progressive or Bull Moose party. There was a fierce contest over these two planks, in which finally the will of George W. Perkins prevailed over the will of the majority of the convention: the trust plank being actually changed after it had been passed by the convention and sent to the press. It was an extraordinary performance, but not isolated in American development. Rather was it typical of the power and audacity of wealth. The same George W. Perkins seized control of the Mitchel campaign of 1917, and allowed nobody to be represented in it except his friends. Probably such

amazing performances will take place as long as our liberal efforts depend merely on individuals.

Although the campaign of 1912 brought out, especially from Mr. Brandeis, much profound treatment of the trust question it did not create any real issue between the parties. That question remains in solution, waiting for some leader or leaders to tie up one party affirmatively with one or more of the various answers to it.

Political philosophers argue perpetually about the degree to which individuals can influence the course of peoples. There is still a school in which history is treated as if it were little more than a series of battles and biographies. More in the intellectual fashion is the contrasting exaggeration, in which, carried along by the vague ideas of pseudo-science, we treat individual forces as negligible, swallowed altogether in the environment. No doubt in the long run it is the more general influences that persist. They reinforce the changes made by individuals or overcome them. But conditions are often uncertain and fluid and therefore within the control of strong men. The public is often like wax, to take and hold a shape given to it by an individual; or like sheep, ready to be led in more than one direction. Conditions control individuals and peoples, but men, sometimes few in number, create conditions. Only the

arbitrary insistence on a theory can lead us to deny serious influence to Jesus, Copernicus, Luther, Washington, Rousseau or Watts. Every man who helps so to build that an established civilization retains vitality or that a new civilization, or a new element in life, is made articulate and appealing, is a force in the world's life. To my mind the time has not yet come when the question of the man can, in this country at any rate, be subordinated. The man, in any Presidential election, ought to be the dividing issue now, until the party division takes on a real meaning.

The Wilson record of constructive legislation from 1913 to 1917 was by far the most fundamental accomplished by any national administration since the civil war. Does this fact mean that the Democratic party is the liberal party of the country, and that a person with ideas of fundamental progress can comfortably find his home there? I may illustrate the difficulty by an incident that took place in a group of nine men in 1918, all of whom were unusually independent. We put the question: "Suppose you were compelled to decide now to vote the same ticket for twenty years. Which would you choose?" It was much to my surprise that all except one chose the Democratic ticket, not on any belief that Wilson or men like him could continue to dominate the party steadily, but along this line:

the Democratic party includes more of the very poor, and it is more complicated by the negro question in the South and the religious question in the North. These two burdens are heavy. The Republican party is the party of heavy respectability and wealth, which is a more unmanageable burden even than those carried by the Democrats.

This same question came up in the Presidential campaign of 1916, when it was my special duty to argue with the men who had been prominent Bull Moosers in 1912. We got a good many of them, mostly on the proof that Mr. Wilson was more radical than Mr. Hughes, but we lost one of the strongest of them, after several weeks of argument, because he took the opposite view of the difficulties I have just mentioned. He is a good friend of mine; and he and I talked at length off and on through weeks, but the gist of his conclusion was this: "I hope and believe Wilson will be elected. He is much more of a radical than Hughes and much more intelligent. But my decision cannot be made for 1916 alone. There are reasons why I cannot be a free lance like you, but must choose my party now, to work in it for perhaps twenty years. Thousands of young men will be affected by my decision. I must ask myself where these young men belong. I do not believe this country can best be conducted by a party containing three elements that

I distrust. I do not like the influence of down-and-outers; I fear the effect that the race situation has on Southern opinion; and I prefer the Protestant conscience to the Catholic influence. Therefore I vote for Hughes, although preferring Wilson."

Not being much of a hand at generalizing about the respective merits of Southerners and Northerners, Catholics and Protestants, the failures as a class and the successful as a class, I cannot take seriously any of these arguments for any special lasting superiority in either of our parties. The party man, of course, if a person of ideals, hopes to do his bit toward drawing the great instrument his way. When I spoke to the President once about these difficulties, he made a real answer, as he always does. He replied that he hoped to see the Democratic party large enough to control any reactionary or irresponsible elements it might have, and he has done a wonderful amount for modern liberalism; but has it affected his party in any important way?

The two party system has its serious advantages. Through England's modern history up to now it has seemed the best of political machines, and it was the failure of the liberals to show more depth in industrial matters, emphasized by their failure to show nobility and power in the war and the settlement, that caused so rapid a growth of the Labor Party. In the United States hitherto two parties

have sufficed. It seems likely, however, that to lead in the establishment of industrial democracy a new party may be required. Germany and France, for example, have required numerous groups to express adequately the various opinions. Habit and tradition in the United States have more resemblance to England than to other countries, and it is at least probable that not more than three parties, possibly not more than two (if one reforms), will become strong enough to figure seriously in Congress. Unless the standpatters prevail mightily, there will not be much danger that non-parliamentary parties like some of the communists will grow strong. Unless these blind holders of power are able to exert pressure until there is an explosion the normal development may be hoped for, and the normal development will be the creation, by accretion or by accident, of one party that fairly represents the liberal minds of the country, now divided up, being a minority among the Republicans, the Democrats, the Socialists, with a number who have remained independent because of the absence of a liberal party. Just what such a party will be like, if it is born, we cannot of course tell with exactness, but I think that before we get through this little book we can pick out the most important steps toward an industrial solution and at least hope that either a new party or just possibly one of the old

parties may develop along those lines. If such a party showed vigor, I for one should feel compelled to join it, thus sacrificing to some extent a dearly-loved personal freedom. The mere inclusion of some Marxian planks, such as the British Labor platform has, would not keep me away, if the immediate program and the general direction were right, for if we are to have political health there must be some party to represent social-industrial needs, and theories about remoter outcomes can be left to the cure of experience and the responsibilities of power. I should be forced to join such a party by belief in groping experience; in free, striving effort; by the same logic that led me from the beginning to favor a cure of Russian Bolshevism by non-intervention, and the resulting inevitable internal changes, instead of by guns, gas and blockade

CHAPTER V

FACING BOLSHEVISM: OUR FOLLIES IN RUSSIA

"Why, 'tis as easy as lying."
"Hamlet."

"We suppose that in all modern history there has never been a case of the suppression of the truth so general and so successful as the suppression of the truth about Bolshevism."
From "The New Statesman," London.

"The most fatal . . . errors of men are frequently the most excusable . . . They are committed when a strong impetus of right carries them up to a certain point, and a residue of that impetus, drawn from the contact with human passion and infirmity, pushes them beyond it. They vault into the saddle; they fall on the other side. The instance most commonly present to my mind is the error of England in entering the revolutionary war in 1793. Slow sometimes to go in, she is slower yet to come out, and if she had then held her hand, the course of the revolution and the fate of Europe would in all likelihood have been widely different. There might have been no Napoleon. There might have been no Sedan."
Gladstone.

FOR a student of what constitutes news in America, and particularly news in wartime, it would be interesting to find out how many American newspapers printed the letter of the leading political thinker left alive from the old Russia, Prince Kropotkin, written to Georg Brandes on April 28, 1919, and published in l'Humanité on October 10th. Kropotkin said: "We are now going through what France lived through during the Jacobin revolution, from September, 1792, to July, 1794, with the addition that now there is a social revolution that is seeking its path.

"The dictatorship method of the Jacobins was false. It was unable to create a stable organization and it was inevitable that it should lead to reaction. But the Jacobins accomplished, nevertheless, in June, 1793, the abolition of feudal rights, which neither the Constituent Assembly nor the Legislative Assembly was able to bring about. Also they proclaimed aloud the political equality of all citizens. These were two immense fundamental changes which in the course of the nineteenth century made the tour of Europe.

"An analogous fact is now coming into being in Russia. The Bolsheviks are undertaking to introduce, by the dictatorship of a fraction of the Social-Democratic party, socialization of land, industry,

and commerce. The change which they are undertaking to bring about is the fundamental principle of Socialism. Unhappily, the method by which they undertake to enforce, in a strongly centralized state, a communism recalling that of Babeuf—which is paralyzing the constructive work of the people—this method renders success absolutely impossible. It paves the way for a furious, wicked reaction. This reaction is already attempting to organize itself to bring back the old régime, taking advantage of the general exhaustion, caused at first by the war, then by the famine that we are undergoing in central Russia, and by the complete disorganization of trade and production, which was inevitable during a revolution as vast as this, brought about by issuing decrees.

"In the west there is talk of reëstablishing 'order' in Russia by an armed intervention of the allies. Well, dear friend, you know how criminal toward all the social progress of Europe was, in my opinion, the attitude of those who sought to disorganize Russia's resisting power; an act which prolonged the war by a year, gave us the German invasion under cover of a treaty, and required rivers of blood to prevent a conquering Germany from crushing Europe under her imperial boot. You well know my feelings about this. Nevertheless I protest with all my ability against every kind of armed interven-

tion by the allies in Russian affairs. Such an intervention would cause an access of Russian jingoism. It would bring back a jingo monarchy (there are already signs of it), and take good notice of this, it would cause in the Russian people as a whole a hostile attitude toward occidental Europe, an attitude which would have sad consequences. The Americans have already understood this.

"It is imagined, perhaps, that in supporting Admiral Kolchak and General Denikin, support is being given to the liberal, to the republican element. But that is an error. Whatever may be the personal intentions of these two chieftains those around them have other plans. Inevitably what they would bring us would be a return to monarchy, to reaction, and to further streams of blood.

". . . Instead of playing the part that Austria, Prussia, and Russia played toward France in 1793, the allies should have done everything possible to help the Russian people out of this terrible situation. . . . It is in building a new future, by the constructive working out of a new life, in spite of everything, that the allies should help us. Without delay, come to the help of our children. Come to help us in the needed constructive work. For this help, send us not diplomats and generals, but bread, tools for production, and organizers, who were so well able to assist the allies during these

terrible five years in preventing economic disorganization, and in repelling the barbarous invasion of the Germans."

In discussing political tendencies and difficulties we can seek a formal simplicity, a consistency of words, or we can endeavor rather to follow the actual working of the human mind, which is far from thinking with the narrower consistency. Russia may seem a long distance from trusts, labor parties, lack of significance in our party divisions. But if you are accustomed to talking with a number of active-minded young men, in college and recently out of it, you will not find it so. If you are accustomed to addressing audiences of people who earn their wages from day to day you will not find it so. To the mentally active young, and to questioning labor, Russia is indeed what President Wilson, in that phrase of inspiration, called it. It is the "acid test." It tests our economic standpoint. It tests our political sincerity. It tests the New York Assembly and the Attorney General of the United States. It tests the efficiency of our knowledge and of our wisdom. It tests our adequacy to build a new material welfare in Europe. It tests our ability to devise the right remedies for the momentous stirring everywhere that we loosely call Bolshevism. We call it Bolshevism, whether it is aimless dissent, tired nervousness, or lucid striving

for equality. The name has come to cover the things of which we are most afraid. We must face the Russian situation or we cannot face the home situation. And this is true everywhere: in England, Germany, Italy, France, Poland even America.

One of the most prevalent and tiresome faults of liberals and intellectual radicals is putting emphasis on the faults that have been made by those in authority, without offering any definite and exact substitutes. There are circumstances in which, however one may wish to avoid the error of censure in excess, the rational policy can have its elementary foundation only by a vivid understanding of the falsity, evil or unsoundness of the present system. This need of complete exposure will occur especially in complex and fluid circumstances, of great importance; and still more especially if the public mind has been drugged into a wholly unreal conception of the facts involved. Such a situation is presented in Russia. If the faults of the big western governments in their treatment of the Communist threat had been such as were entirely unlikely to recur there would be little use in setting down the folly with which frightened capital muddled the Russian situation. It will be years, however, before conditions in Russia receive an unmistakable stamp, and for years, therefore, we shall be deciding and

re-deciding the exact degree of hypocrisy, fear, and force on which we are to rely.

In the early months of 1918 I began to urge on my friends in office, and on others, the belief that the best hope of a solution in Russia lay in the great coöperative associations. Old political divisions had been rendered almost meaningless. People still talked about Kadets and Octobrists and Socialist Revolutionaries, but the only important political divisions were the Bolsheviks, the Czarists, and a miscellaneous group who were neither. New political divisions would have to come with time, and respond to the needs of a new time. Meantime the actual Russian masses were expressing themselves, not politically, but in their daily business. A large part of their necessary production, and a larger part of their necessary distribution, were being carried on by institutions that were old, familiar, and persistent through political upheaval. These great coöperative institutions represented, in my opinoin, the actual life of Russia, and I thought that if we could break through political divisions and establish contact with them we might be on the track of doing something. About a year later I went to Denmark, as Minister, mainly because of the belief that I could from Copenhagen get much more light on the Russian problem than I could from the United States. While I was getting ready to sail

Mr. Alexander Berkenheim came to the United States. He brought a letter from Prince Kropotkin to a public-spirited American, who referred Mr. Berkenheim to me. Later history has shown how fully Mr. Berkenheim represented the Russian coöperatives, and the best in Russia. I introduced him to powerful political people here and urgently repeated my beliefs about the coöperatives.

Russia and the whole world had suffered indescribably from an ignorant and meddlesome policy for many sad months before I went to Denmark. It was not long after my return that Paris finally took the first step toward burying its suicidal policy and entered into a contract to trade with Mr. Berkenheim. Our newspapers, busy about other things, gave such incomplete accounts of this historic transaction that I give the documents at the end of this chapter.

As far as I can tell in May, 1920, the step was taken too late. The Communists would have been too weak to oppose the coöperatives up to the late fall of 1919. Now they seem strong enough to "nationalize" them, and the obvious efforts of the Entente to interfere in every guise has strengthened the extremer elements.

Why was it necessary to go through such incredible errors and sufferings? The first symptoms of

governmental myopia began with the first revolution, in March, 1917. I was at the British front at the time. Military men were nervous, naturally, and they could not be expected to feel what an enormous part of the effort to make the world safe for democracy had been or should have been, successful when one of the two strongest despotisms in the world had been suddenly changed into a self-governing country. When I first went to London, however, and read the official expressions of confidence in the Czar, and sympathy with him, and the cold references to the perfectly orderly undertaking of constitutional government I felt that blight of the official mind which we have all felt so many times in these years of test and disillusion. The Lvov government speedily found itself too conservative to meet the new needs, and Kerenski, as the most radical member of that government, was spontaneously lifted to the first place. Whether he could have weathered the storm had the powers treated him intelligently can never be known, but they did treat him both blindly and dishonestly. He told them that Russia could no longer fight, unless war aims were restated in non-imperialistic form, in such a way that Germany could either accept them, and thus gain nothing from the war except disillusion, or reject them, and thus put Russia in a situation where she could probably be kept in the war. He

favored the Stockholm conference, and because Mr. Arthur Henderson told the truth about Kerenski's views Mr. Lloyd George tried to convince the British public that Mr. Henderson was a liar.

The Bolshevik seizure of power followed. We soon took our part in the misrepresentations that filled the world. The distribution of blame for our part in the tragedy it would not be becoming in me to make. Some of our leading men have a good record regarding Russia, others a reactionary record, and many have seemed merely at sea or asleep. But I should feel a coward if I did not speak what I think about the conduct of all the governments.

As to the ultimate effect of the propaganda of atrocities, of which all the nations were guilty, the most effective comment I have seen was that of Norman Angell, in the London Herald, an organ of the Labor Party. Mr. Angell said:

"Assume, if you will, that all these stories—of the German atrocities during the war, of the Russian atrocities that we are now exploiting—are true, practically every one of them. Nevertheless, we are using them in such a way as to make of them a gross falsehood and to involve injustice, dishonesty, degradation to ourselves, and a perversion of policy for which our country is destined one day to pay a very bitter price. Let the thing be made plain by a very concrete illustration.

"Here is an atrocity story about whose authenticity I will say nothing till I have given it in full:

"'In a large provincial town two "bourgeois," vaguely charged with counter-revolution, were seized by local Bolshevik bands, taken into the town square, where thousands of Bolshevik adherents witnessed, not only with no protest but with jeers and execration, the following: The two prisoners were first bound; their tongues were then slowly torn out with pincers; hot irons were then brought and each living eyeball slowly burned. They were then stripped, and with other hot irons unnamable mutilations were inflicted. A fire was then lit, and what remained of the tortured and quivering, but living, flesh was thrown upon the fire and slowly roasted to death. This crowd of Bolsheviks—some thousands of them—then set up the cry that the wives of these hated bourgeois should be treated in the same fashion. One of them was found. She happened to be pregnant. She was seized, stripped, tied by her feet to the branch of a tree in the square, obscenely mutilated, and then also burned alive.

"'What makes the thing particularly damning are two facts. First, that these incredible tortures were committed with the full knowledge of, were witnessed indeed by, the local "authorities." Secondly, that the Central Soviet and Lenin himself were made acquainted with what had taken place. The

Bolshevik press published accounts of the incident. And some individual Bolsheviks of the more intellectual type were bold enough to ask Lenin to receive a deputation to discuss whether the Central Soviet could not stop the acquiescence of the local Soviet authorities in this sort of thing. Lenin replied he was too busy to receive a deputation on such a subject.'

"Here, then, is an atrocity, apparently better substantiated than the extremely dubious stories of the very anonymous British officer now being exploited by the 'Times,' the 'Daily Mail,' and the 'Weekly Dispatch.'

"You will say: A political or social theory which leads men to acts of that kind should be stamped out by the combined force of civilization; a Government which can tolerate it should have no recognition from civilized men.

"Well, I do not draw that conclusion from the story of this atrocity. Nor will you, nor would Lord Northcliffe, when one additional fact is told. *The abominations just described took place, not in Russia, but in America—in Texas.* I have merely described a lynching, which the press of the Southern States will duplicate for you almost any week in the year, using 'Bolshevik' to describe the Southern White, 'Soviet' the Southern local authorities, etc. The details are typical of many

lynchings, the facts of which have been carefully verified by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. The outrages in the cases I have in mind were committed in the presence of thousands; the local authorities were fully aware of them; the Federal Government was informed; it has again and again refused to intervene, though when it is a question of arresting Labor agitators, any constitutional obstacles to Federal action within individual states is swept away in a twinkling. When, after the East St. Louis pogrom, in which 120 negro men, women, and children were massacred, a delegation of negroes asked to see President Wilson, he was too busy.

"Those crimes are numbered by hundreds and thousands; have gone on, not in the midst of the passions of war, but in the quiet and security of country towns as ordinary things, almost normal to life in certain of the American States. And they go on against a race that has never risen in rebellion; is unarmed, and whose very presence on American soil is testimony, not to any fault of theirs, but to a monstrous crime of the Anglo-Saxon race whose members inflict the torture—the African slave-catching which our forefathers carried out.

"Is the parallel close enough?

"Why are we right then in not letting a thing so abominable stand in the way of our friendship with

America? Because the American people are capable of a good deal more than lynching abominations. They show daily, in numberless circumstances, humanity and generosity, kindliness, and idealism; and the truth, and our treatment of them, demands that if in justice we condemn the evil we take account also of the good—and remember the evil that is in ourselves.

"Imagine that we had drifted from commercial jealousy of America into our third war with her. From that moment these people, who, in the South at least, are of our blood, would become, not people very like ourselves, but merely lynchers. The lynching horrors would rapidly become our normal picture of American society and character.

"And the picture is utterly false. If side by side with every story of cruelty by a German or Russian we placed first the numberless acts of kindness, humanity, and even heroism, which in the past Russians and Germans have done for our people; if by the side of every atrocity of which we accuse them we had to place every atrocity of which they can accuse us or our allies—the severity which marked in the early days the invasion of East Prussia, the conduct of the blacks employed by France, the children we have killed with our blockades (even after the war was ended), the sort of things our own soldiers (e.g., Mr. Stephen Graham) calmly relate in

their own books—if these things were also told we could not use atrocity stories in the way we do. We should not draw the conclusions that we do. We should see that these abominations, past and present, are not crimes which we must impute to some special wickedness in Germans, Russians, Americans, Belgian, French, Catholic Inquisitor, Protestant Conqueror, but to evil and the misguided passions common to mankind; to the obscene lusts of violence which, once let loose and placed at the service of myopic tribal instincts, of a perverted nationalism, of race hatred, mob passion, and detestation of the heretic political or religious, render their victims blind, deaf, hardly conscious.

"This temper that we are now cultivating may easily be transferred to the conflict of the classes. Those who now fight this exploitation of hate will be blamed for its inevitable results in the class war, and blamed by those who have deliberately cultivated the passions that will have made those results inevitable.

"This 'falsification by atrocity' is enveloping the world in hate and fear and the passion of vengeance, destroying all the courageous idealism that should inspire the new time. It is blinding us to the right policy for our country, and is of infinite menace to our national safety and our social welfare."

War can pay its measureless cost only if the world

is shocked into change of heart. Several years of starvation and semi-starvation in Europe may create a deep-lying moral revolt against the persistence of outlived sanctions, of decayed beliefs, of which we had been promised that victory should mean their end. The instinctive, cohesive capitalist war against Russia must in the near future be seen in all its starkness. Why, since the autumn of 1917, has such passion gone to blackening indiscriminately the character of the Bolshevik leaders? I do not myself believe in their doctrines, but why do we need an orgy of misrepresentation? The violence is not inferior to that which led us to depict all Germany as Hun. We enjoy being cruel to our enemies of the moment, but the cruellest of all impulses is fear, and we seem to fear that if the debates were conducted honestly on our side the communist lure might seduce our masses. We do not care to realize that if we cannot win against communism honestly we cannot win at all. I believe we could win honestly because I believe extreme communism, especially communism by force, is unsound.

The Sisson documents were, in their total history, certainly not less disgraceful than the manifestos of the German professors. History will dismiss them in a line without serious comment, except by special students of war morals. In a treatise by some fu-

ture investigator on fictions of the world-war, they might hold a distinguished place. This future excavator of ideas will look back with at least the pleasure of irony on the fact that those cheap forgeries were sent over the United States as propaganda, supported by the name of a historian in high standing and a professor of Russian in a great university. If the British newspapers refused to print them, it was not so much because of superior morals as because many of the same documents had been printed in France and discredited many months before.

At the time of their appearance, if you wished to damn a group, you called it pro-German; so these documents proceeded to produce an inhumanly complete dossier, which dossier seemed to have been carefully prepared by the Bolshevik leaders, and reduced to writing, without a flaw in the evidence, to furnish complete demonstration of their venality and their subservience to Germany. It was before General von Hoffman said that Foch might think himself the conqueror of Germany if he liked, but that the real victor over her was Lenin. It was before Ludendorff's memoirs, in spite of his satisfaction over Brest-Litovsk, unwittingly confirmed Hoffman's view of the part Bolshevik thought played in the crumbling of German discipline. The anti-Bolshevik propagandists, at the

time of the Sisson publication, required something intense Lenin's reported saying, "I made the Russian revolution with German gold, and I shall make the German revolution with Russian gold," may be apocryphal or true; but in any case, that point of view would not have been strong enough. So we made what we required.

Evidence is strong that, if the Entente had been willing to express democratic war-aims during the preliminaries to Brest-Litovsk, the Germans would have rejected the terms and the Soviets would have coöperated with the Entente. The situation in this respect was similar to the situation at the time that Kerenski, knowing of the secret treaties, so pleadingly sought from the Entente such a revision of war aims as might have led either to peace or to a lining-up of the Russian proletarian and peasant consciences on the side of the Entente. The red-blooded elements in the Entente countries would have none of either of these mollycoddle proposals. They preferred to lead Europe to where she stands now. Had it been only the real faults of Bolshevism that stirred us—dictatorship, despotic bureaucracy, theories simplified beyond life—I do not think gross falsehood would have been required. The governments of the world were combined against one wearied and demoralized government. They furnished soldiers against it until their people

told them that they would not stand for such personal inconvenience as sending soldiers; thereafter they furnished guns, tanks, poison gas and newspaper stories. They put on the blockade, which fell last of all on the army. Sometimes it seemed they would have been willing to starve every woman and child in Russia rather than allow a communist despotism to take its chances with its own population. Of course, the intervention and blockade were cloaked in proclamations about atrocities, but does there exist one sane being blind enough to pretend that if there had been a *de facto* government, equally despotic and equally repressive, but conservative, the world would have coalesced with such excitement to put it down, with no declaration of war and no submission of the question to peoples or even to parliaments? The question answers itself. It was a class war, and to deck it up in moral principles is the greatest of all the hypocrisies that corroded our victory. Nor is there any more honesty in the excuse that it was a war of defense, in the plain sense of those words, for the willingness of the Bolsheviki to stop fighting external enemies if they could be left to their task of organization at home was overwhelmingly proved for those who were willing to believe.

The final excuse was "standing by our friends." We did not have to stand by Kerenski or any of our

friends except those who wished to intervene; nor did we count among our friends the millions whose sons and brothers had been thrown recklessly against death machines until the peaceful soul of the vast peasant-country cried aloud for peace and land as against all the tinsel of the empire seekers, the so-called leaders of parties, the vendors of heroic words.

No wonder old Kropotkin, who disliked Bolshevism, sided nevertheless with it against outside savagery. No wonder the most distinguished writers in France spoke in accents of horror. No wonder that Henderson, when he put the horrible cruelty and hypocrisy of the Russian policy fairly before a British electorate, was sent triumphantly to parliament. No wonder that Lloyd George spoke of the inhumanity and the egregious folly of that policy, always except when he needed the blood-lust in elections or in retaining power, and took the lead in raising the blockade when he could control his country and his allies. For nearly two years all the machinery of life was bent to one end: it was better that a million innocents should starve than that a communistic experiment should be allowed to proceed more rapidly to its inevitable collapse or modification.

To a man I trust I explained my belief that Bolshevism was a war-phenomenon, not a peace-

phenomenon; that if we had treated it in a neutral spirit, or even in the friendly spirit we showed to the government of the Czar, it could not have lasted a fraction of the time that it lasted in arms against the world. I quoted this conversation that I had in 1918 with an economic thinker:

I: "Suppose you were able to dictate the way we should treat Lenin, what would your policy be?"

He: "I would give him everything he wanted. It is the only way to end him."

Of course this thinker meant that discontent is cured by intercourse and responsibility. The man to whom I repeated the conversation neither accepted nor denied my contentions, but showed that he had something in the back of his head. So I said: "Men of your philosophy have had the conduct of the war, and the conduct of this Russian adventure. How do you like the world that you have created?"

"At least," he replied, "we have retained our self-respect."

Is it not epic? I must recall now the appeal that was most primitive, alongside the tales of pro-Germanism, mutilations, and so on. It was the woman-note, the challenge to the protecting instinct of the male, that must be sounded, as it was sounded against Germany, as the British sounded it against the Boers, as it has been used in all the civilized

wars in history. The more Russian women are starved, the more necessary it becomes to prove that the Bolsheviki treat women wickedly. So we seized upon the nationalization of women. Evidence that women held a higher position in Bolshevik Russia than in Germany, France, England, or America, could get little attention. Many explanations of how the story started have been given. Here are three given to me by Americans who were in Russia at the time or soon after:

(1) When the Bolsheviki gave the full vote to women the Mohammedan world was shocked, and used an expression which was translated back into some language as the nationalization of women.

(2) A barber went crazy in Odessa and promulgated such a decree. He was promptly sent to an asylum.

(3) A comic paper in Petrograd wrote a parody of communist ideas.

The British War Office presumably knew by August, 1919, not only the falsity of the charge, but also the fact that the Bolshevik laws of marriage, divorce, women's labor, women's pay, women's political rights, are more enlightened than those prevailing in the West. But in August, 1919, wishing to induce British boys to go to kill Russians, it issued a pamphlet. Did it tell the truth as a basis for their volunteering? No, it relied on two argu-

ments; in both cases showing at the same time a sufficient knowledge of their falsity. In the language is an avoidance of the specific charge that the Bolsheviki were bribed by the Germans, while enough is clung to for purpose of instigation. There is likewise an avoidance of the specific charge of nationalization of women by the central government, while there is a mean clinging to it by charging that it occurred in places not named, and therefore beyond proof. This document bears the following title-page:

NOTES FOR PERSONNEL
VOLUNTEERING FOR SERVICE
With the
BRITISH MILITARY MISSION
in
SOUTH RUSSIA
(Issued by the General Staff)

WAR OFFICE (S. E. 2.). *August,* 1919.

Extracts from it are (with italics by me):

BOLSHEVISM

1. What is now known as Bolshevism developed from a small band of extreme Socialists who lived in Switzerland and were sent into Russia by the German General Staff through Germany and Sweden as soon as it was realized that the Russian Pro-

visional Government was determined to prosecute the war. Though this party had nothing in common with Imperial Germany, *it was content to take German money and play Germany's game* in order to get hold of the reins of authority in Russia.

2. It defeated the Provisional Government of Kerenski, and came in on the cry of "Peace, Land, Freedom and Bread." It has given Russia none of these things; *it cared for none of them.* They were merely the lure to attract to its side the peasants and workmen, so as, with them, to destroy entirely the existing organization.

3. The genuine Bolsheviks are mostly non-Russian internationalists. Their creed is that the world has made such a mess of Christian civilization, that *the latter must be stamped out.* They hold that the root of all evil is the sense of possession, and that this sense is fostered by the ideas of nationality *and family.*

4. Their program is to eradicate by means of revolution in every country these ideas of nationality *and family.*

5. In Russia they are not only endeavoring to annihilate the existing possessing classes, but are deliberately trying to ensure that the new generation shall grow up free from all ideas of possession.

6. *The well-known decree for the nationalization of women* did not come from the Central Bolshevik Government, but it has been put into force in *several towns.* By this decree all women were forced to report at a "commissariat of free love," where they might be selected by any man, and had no right to refuse.

7. The decree for the nationalization of children

provided that all children over five became the property of the State.

8. Having originally protested against the brutality of the death sentence in the old army, they have reintroduced, not only death for desertion, but also death without trial for other offences committed by their conscripts, and they shoot the wives and families, and sometimes even large numbers of the fellow villagers, of deserters.

9. The Bolshevism they preach in foreign countries is very different to what they practice in Russia, but we must realize that it is what they practice that they wish to introduce among us.

This is cock-sure enough. I compare it with the account in the London Times of November 18, 1919, of a speech by Labor Leader Arthur Henderson in the House of Commons: "For about ten months organized labor in this country had been appealing to the government to provide facilities for a commission to visit Russia to ascertain the facts concerning the situation, and that request had been denied. Passports had been refused to a deputation from the International Conference representing the organized working classes of nearly every country in the world."

But even if it did take all possible steps to prevent information from being obtained, the War Office, before it issued the warlike appeal for Denikin volunteers, must have known something about

the attitude of the Bolsheviki toward family relations.

It was in February, 1919, that the Russian Information Bureau in England issued the following document:

"Numerous conflicting and absurd reports have been widely circulated in this country to the effect that marriage as hitherto known has been virtually abolished in Soviet Russia. It is alleged on the one hand that women are socialized and that a woman may be seized by any man who desires her. On the other hand it is said that any woman of twenty-one may have any man she chooses. New Europe for October 31, 1918, appears to have set the ball rolling by an article entitled, 'The Bolsheviks and the Status of Women.' This article contained what is stated to be a translation of a decree issued by the Bolsheviks of Vladimir and 'published in the official Soviet organ, Isvestija.' Neither the date of the decree nor that of its publication in the Isvestija was given by New Europe.

"The New Europe also referred to 'the socialization of women in the city of Hoolinsky, and vicinity,' which, it says, has been published in the local Gazette of the Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies. Again no dates are given. There is no such city in Russia as Hoolinsky.

"The origin of these fables can be traced to Maxim Gorki's paper, the Novaya Zhizn, which was at one time a violent and unscrupulous opponent of the Soviets, though Gorky has since recanted and issued to the world a glowing eulogy of the Bolsheviki and joined the Soviet administra-

tion. In the early summer of 1918 the Novaya Zhizn republished an article written by a woman on freer sexual relationships which had been published by the Isvestija, or News, of a small, local Soviet at Vladimir, in a Far-Eastern province. Gorki's paper, instead of treating it as a freak, quoted it as an instance of Bolshevik rule.

"The actual law relating to marriage and parentage passed by the Soviet Government for all Russia provides the best answer to the slanders which are being circulated. It will be seen that the main difference between the Soviet law and our own is that illegitimate children have the same claim upon their parents as legitimate children."

The Bureau then quoted the Soviet Marriage Law, as follows:

"The Russian Republic recognizes as legal civil marriages only.

"The following are the regulations concerning civil marriages:

"1. Persons intending to marry must notify either verbally or in writing the registry office for marriages and for births, attached to the county, district, or parish council, in the district of their abode.

"NOTE.—Civil marriage is absolutely obligatory. The additional performance of a church ceremony is the private affair of the individuals concerned.

"2. Notifications of marriages are not accepted:

(a) From males under 18 years of age and from females under 16 years of age. For the natives of Transcaucasus the legal age for mar-

riage is 16 years of age for males and 13 years of age for females.

(b) From relatives of lineal descent, brothers and sisters, half-brothers and half-sisters. These regulations apply to relatives of a similar degree even though one or both the parties were born outside wedlock.

(c) From married persons, and

(d) From lunatics.

"3. It is necessary for those intending to marry to call at the registry office for marriages and to sign a form declaring that they are free from impediments to marriage cited in Article 2 of this decree, and further that the marriage is a voluntary act on their part.

"Persons deliberately making false statements concerning the non-existence of the impediments stated in Article 2 will be proceeded against for making these false declarations and their marriages declared void.

"4. The officer in charge at the registry office for marriages, after obtaining the required signatures, enters the fact in the registry book and then declares the marriage already to be in force.

"In entering upon wedlock the couple may freely decide what surname they will adopt, the name of the husband, the name of the wife, or the joint surname of both.

"To prove the performance of the marriage, a copy of the marriage license is issued immediately and given to the couple.

"5. Appeals against refusal to perform the marriage ceremony, or against any irregularity in the entry in the register, can be made at any time to the

local judge in the district where the marriage was registered, and the decision of the local judge can be appealed against in the ordinary legal way.

"6. If the register of marriage should be destroyed, or lost in any other way, or if married couples are for any other reason unable to obtain a copy of their marriage license, the persons concerned are entitled within a certain date to make a statement concerning their marriage at the registry office of the district where they both live, or where either party lives. They must again give their signature, as required by Article 4 of this Decree, and also in addition must sign a statement that the book has been lost, or that for some other reason worthy of consideration, they are unable to obtain their marriage license. This will be considered as sufficient ground for reëntering the marriage and for again issuing a copy of the marriage certificate.

"7. The birth of a child must be registered at the registry office of marriages and births in the district in which the mother resides. The birth of each child must be separately registered.

"8. The birth of a child must be notified at the local registry office by one or both parents, or, in case of the parents' death, by the person who is in charge of the newly-born child. The name and surname of the child must be given and two witnesses must attest the birth.

"9. The registers of marriages and births are kept in duplicate; at the end of twelve months one copy is to be transmitted for preservation to the appropriate Court.

"10. Illegitimate children are to be treated in the same manner as legitimate children in regard to

their rights and obligations towards their parents and the rights and obligations of the parents towards these children.

"The persons who notify, and give their signatures as the parents of the child, are recognized as the father and mother of the child.

"In case of an illegitimate child, where the father omits to give the above-mentioned notification, the mother, the guardian, or the child has the legitimate right to prove the paternity."

To discuss such general charges as that the Germans were Huns, or that the Bolsheviki were not a fanatic sect but a group of brigands seeking excuses for plunder can be done adequately only some years from now, when more facts are available, and when the world is willing to consider all the difficulties of assuming the reins of government when the war spirit of the country was completely broken, as Kerenski had seen; when transport and general industry were disorganized; when Russia politically was hopelessly broken into irreconcilable groups; to fight under those conditions for over two years, against the Germans, Chekho-Slovak armies, the various Russian armies, the Japanese, the British, the French, the Americans, the Poles, and various border states; to have to manage transportation and industry without the coal-fields and the oil-wells; to be prevented from buying the machinery and parts of machinery not produced in Russia.

What I think of dictatorship by the proletariat scarcely needs further elaboration, but my disbelief in that doctrine never made me happy in blockades, invasions, and campaigns of calumny. That brigands were at large in Russia there is no doubt; that their power became greater as the situation became worse is clear; but to charge the original Bolshevik national leaders with low motives is simply to prostitute our own minds. Krassin's work must have been uncommonly efficient. It is certain that no more powerful intellect than Lenin's was brought to the surface in the whole struggle. Men like Chicherin, sacrificing wealth and ease to follow the light as they saw it, were not rascals.

We in our infinite wisdom made it as hard as possible to get the truth either into Russia or out of it, and when a few men did bring out narratives—as Raymond Robins, Colonel Thompson, Arthur Ransome, W. T. Goode, Frazier Hunt, Lincoln Steffens, Phillips Price, Colonel Malone—we called them Bolsheviki, arrested them, or said they were so hypnotized by Lenin or others that they could neither see nor think. The psychology was much like that of a high French official who protested to me in 1915 against my exposure of certain careful concoctions against the Germans. "I do not doubt your word," he said, "but if you show that these charges are false, the people will not be-

lieve other charges which are true." O sacred truth, how delicate your constitution is! Often the metaphor of disease was used to me. If free exchanges of facts and ideas were permitted, the horrid communist scourge would spread as an epidemic. I might turn the figure of speech, treating fresh air as the most general cure, or speaking of suppressing symptoms and driving poison under the surface; but it was useless, for almost unconquerable was the *Schadenfreude,* the will to believe the worst.

It did not take Lenin, fanatical Marxian though he was, long to realize that the facts were more complex than his theories, and he and Krassin were the leaders in trying to find a method of introducing bourgeois efficiency without entirely losing the fruits of the industrial revolution. One over-generalization after another went to the scrap-heap. The poor peasant was removed from his position of ruler over the most prosperous peasant. A corresponding change took place in the supervision of the city populations, in the control of industry, in the discipline in the army. Lenin and his more tractable followers realized that they had no diagram to deal with, but what to him appeared as the old Adam in man, and to others might appear as his saving graces—unwillingness to work for a far-away or abstract end, personal and family concern

predominating over all else, and a certain Slavonic indolence; in addition to what we would all agree upon as weaknesses, corruption and the tendency to use power, not for ideal ends, but as other bureaucracies and despotisms have forever used it. The world was determined, however, that the Bolsheviki should not profit by their experience, but that their experiment should forcibly be made a failure, in such wise that communism, instead of proving its inadequacy, should be sacrificed on the altar of international hate.

Just as the world refused to allow the Bolsheviki to evolute into some forms of democracy, so it refused to allow other democratic elements the best opportunity to displace them. It forced the Soviet government to keep up a large army, with which it was able to maintain a despotism that otherwise would have been impossible. It enabled the Bolsheviki, on account of this lack of free intercourse, to have their highly colored news about the West believed. It forced thousands of able men to choose between supporting a régime they hated and supporting the motley collection of Czarists, who were the backbone of the invading armies. The lack of food and machinery and the blockade of thought and information gradually took away the heart and the power of resistance from the democratic elements. In 1919 the coöperatives even by them-

selves felt strong enough to pay for, receive and distribute food, wearing apparel, medicine and farm machinery, and to pay for it with the great stores of coöperatively raised material. They were prevented from doing so, for fear the Bolsheviki might get some of the imports. In 1920 we try to do what we should have done in 1918 or 1919: and try it while Poland is invading Russia.

The bitter and narrow attitude of the Entente satisfied the philosophy of the more ruthless Bolsheviki, but in the characters of Lenin and his friends there were too much reasonableness and mercy for them willingly to see Russia suffer as Europe forced her to suffer. Some of the trickiest Bolshevik propagandists encouraged conservative West European acquaintances to spread the more extreme and silly atrocity stories, because according to their philosophy the ultimate success of their world-revolution would be encouraged by the violence of the capitalist régime and endangered by any increase of rationality in the bourgeoisie. They knew that violent western lies helped the extremist element to control the Soviets and they believed that these same crass lies would plant resentment in the dumb labor masses abroad. Such extreme revolutionary minds believed that Raymond Robins was dangerous to their ultimate triumph and Henry Cabot Lodge and Lord Northcliffe were assistants

to it. Those among them who have pressed for a solution have been the more conservative members, like Krassin, or those who, like Lenin, although believing the revolution must come in its time, nevertheless regretted the infinite suffering, and thought that their country was not sufficiently developed for a complete communist experiment.

Note: Much of the solidest information about what is really happening in Russia can be obtained in New York from the agents of the coöperatives. The following chart shows the Russian coöperative Organizations represented in America in 1920.

ORGANIZATIONS	Year Organized	Present Membership	Number of Local Societies	Number of Regional Unions	Cash Capital (rubles)	Yearly Turnover (rubles)	Industries Operated
All-Russian Central Union of Consumers' Societies ("Centrosoyuz").....	1898	15,539,169	45,997	361	166,849,425	2,105,789,796	Flour mills, candy, shoe, starch, leather, biscuit, tobacco, soap, syrup, chemical and match factories; creameries, fisheries, oil crushing plants, coal mines, meat packing plants.
Central Association of Flax Growers.....	1915	1,500,000	3,500	48	2,352,278	421,593,093	40,000 tons flax; 3,000 tons seed
Moscow Narodny Bank...	1912	9,000 sharehold.		51 branches	100,000,000	5,823,578,394	Transacts all banking business
Union of Siberian Coöperative Unions ("Zakoopsbyt").....	1916	2,985,620	10,492	34	27,736,499	424,000,000	Soap, perfumery, chemical, brick, rope and cord factories; wool mills, flour mills, salt works, canneries.
Union of Siberian Creamery Association and other Coöperatives.....	1908	600,000	4,448		8,958,114	218,056,150	Creameries, 66% of all the butter produced in Siberia
United Credit Unions of Siberia ("Sincredsoyuz")	1917	1,127,000	1,350	26	3,500,000	270,866,800	Savings and loans. Purchase and sale of agricultural products and agricultural machinery.

On January 16, 1919, the Supreme Council at Paris gave out the following communiqué:

"With a view to remedying the unhappy situation of the population in the interior of Russia, which is now deprived of all manufactured products from outside Russia, the Supreme Council, after having taken note of the report of a committee appointed to consider the reopening of certain trading relations with the Russian people, has decided that it would permit the exchange of goods on the basis of reciprocity between the Russian people and the Allied and neutral countries.

"For this purpose it has decided to give facilities to the Russian coöperative organizations, which are in direct touch with the peasantry throughout Russia, so that they may arrange for the import into Russia of clothing, medicines, agricultural machinery, and the other necessaries of which the Russian people are in sore need, in exchange for grain, flax, etc., of which Russia has surplus supplies."

The following is the report of the Committee appointed by the Supreme Council to consider the reopening of certain trading relations with Russia.

[*This committee was presided over by Mr. E. T. Wise, British representative on the Permament Committee of the Supreme Economic Council, and its other members were M. Kammerer and the Marquis Della Torretta, representatives respectively of the French and Italian Governments.*]

"The Committee understands that it has been instructed to consider the practical details of a scheme for reconstructing trading operations with the whole of Russia without recognizing officially the Bolshevist Government, and that in particular it is to examine how far it is possible for the coöperative organizations to assist in this process.

"The following outline proposals, which are made after taking into consideration the suggestion put forward by Mr. Berkenheim, are recommended for adoption by the Conference on the assumption that direct communications between Allied countries and territories occupied by Bolshevist forces are practicable.

"1. The Allied Governments should inform the coöperative organizations that they are prepared to permit the exchange of goods, on the basis of reciprocity, between all Russia and allied and neutral countries, and should invite these organizations to export surplus grain, food, and raw materials from Russia, so as to provide exchange for clothing and other goods needed by Russia.

"2. The coöperative organizations would then communicate by wireless with their headquarters in Moscow, and inquire whether the coöperative movement was prepared to undertake the responsi-

bility for handling the export and import of goods, and whether such exchanges were practically possible. Representatives of the Paris or London office of the coöperative organizations would at once proceed to Moscow to discuss details.

"3. The coöperative headquarters in Moscow would ascertain whether it would be permitted to export grain, flax, etc., and whether transport and other necessary facilities would be afforded to it.

"4. On receipt of a reply the coöperative headquarters would then communicate its decision to its Paris representatives.

"5. If the coöperative headquarters are prepared to undertake responsibility, Mr. Berkenheim and other officials of the coöperative organizations would then be prepared to make definite contracts to supply grain, flax, etc., from Russia, provided that they were financed at the beginning up to 25 per cent. of the full value of the contracts either direct or through British, French, or Italian co-operative organizations or private traders.

"6. The balance of the credits required, they would themselves provide from their own resources in London, Paris, etc., or by arrangement with the British, French, or Italian Coöperative Movement or private bankers or traders.

"7. They would immediately proceed to start the shipment of goods purchased with these credits to the Black Sea or the Baltic ports, any loss falling on them if the goods were confiscated or destroyed.

"8. With regard to transport, the coöperative headquarters at Moscow would endeavor to secure at least four complete trains from the Bolshevists for use to and from the Black Sea ports. If this was impossible, Mr. Berkenheim and his associates would utilize some of their credits for purchasing trucks and locomotives in Allied countries. They would in any case send out a number of lorries to assist the railways.

"9. As soon as it becomes clear that grain started to be moved out of Russia and that the Bolshevists are offering no resistance, the contracts will, of course, be considerably extended, so as to cover the full amount of at least one million tons of grain, which it is estimated can be exported within a reasonable time."

The following is a statement made by a conference of Russian Coöperatives:

"On January 14th last, Mr. A. M. Berkenheim, the vice-chairman of the All-Russian Central Union of Consumers' Societies, the 'Centrosoyus', was invited by the Supreme Council to put before them the view held by Russian Coöperation on the question of resuming commercial intercourse with the Russian people through the medium of their coöperative organizations.

"A. M. Berkenheim submitted to the Council a detailed report expounding the standpoint of Russian Coöperation as to the neces-

sity and practicability of resuming trade exchange with the population of Russia through her coöperative societies.

"On January 16th the Supreme Council arrived at the decision to permit the resumption of some trading relations between allied and neutral countries and the blockaded parts of Russia through the medium of Russian coöperative organizations.

"In connection with the above a conference took place at Paris on January 20th-24th, attended by the following representatives of Russian coöperative organizations abroad: Madame E. O. Lensky, Messrs. V. N. Zelheim, A. M. Berkenheim, V. K. Vachmistroff, K. I. Morosoff, I. V. Bubnoff, K. I. Popoff, A. E. Malachoff, F. I. Shmeleff, and T. B. Kusin. They represented the following cooperative organizations of Russia: The Moscow Narodny Bank, the All-Russia Central Union of Consumers' Societies (the 'Centrosoyus'), the Union of Siberian Coöperative Unions ('Zakupsbyt'), the Central Association of Flax Growers, the All-Russian Purchasing Union of Agricultural Coöperation (the 'Selskosoyus'), the All-Russian Coöperative Union for the Marketing of Kustar and Artel Products, and the Council of the All-Russian Coöperative Congresses.

"Having heard the report of A. M. Berkenheim, the Conference passed the following resolution:

"1. The conference puts on record that A. M. Berkenheim acted exclusively in the interest of the population of Russia, suffering as it does from the suspension of economic intercourse, and that he has thus shown a true and proper conception of the duties with which he was invested by the population organized around Coöperation.

"2. The Conference thanks A. M. Berkenheim for the initiative and vigor shown by him, which was of the utmost importance at the moment when he was unexpectedly invited to attend the meeting of the Supreme Council.

"At the same time the Conference reaffirms the principle of political neutrality of Coöperation, as proclaimed at various times by All-Russian and provincial Coöperative Conferences, and which is compulsory on the foreign representatives of Russian coöperative organizations abroad.

"With reference to the particular position as created by the decision of the Supreme Council, this principle implies the following:

"1. Under any conditions, which conducting negotiations or entering into agreements with various Governments on questions of trade exchange, Coöperation refuses to associate such activity with the solution of any political problem whatsoever.

"2. The population organized by the Coöperative Movement having entrusted to that movement the protection of its economic inter-

ests, the representatives of Russian Coöperation abroad deem it their duty and moral obligation to approach any foreign or Russian Governments with offers and requests calculated to further their task in the domain of international trade exchange.

"3. The foreign representatives of Russian coöperative organizations, in view of the difficulties of communicating with their boards from whom many of them are completely severed, regard it as their duty and obligation to obey, as far as the reëstablishment of trade relations with abroad is concerned, the one imperative mandate, namely, to assist the restoration of trade exchange in order to satisfy the urgent needs of the population, and to promote the development of the productive resources of Russia by all means at their disposal.

"4. In order to avoid all possible misapprehensions which may arise in connection with the decision of the Supreme Council, the Conference deems it necessary to proclaim that in view of their particular rôle, the foreign representatives of Russian coöperative organizations were not and are not guided in their action by any other motives, as, for instance, the desire to support one or another political group. The sole motive which prompts their action is to supply to the population of all parts of Russia, without exception, means of production and the prime necessities of life, as well as to market Russian products abroad.

"5. The Conference is of opinion that the restoration of economic intercourse between their country and the outside world is necessary in the mutual interests of both Russia and foreign countries, because the colossal economic losses sustained by all countries during the war can be remedied only through an exchange of commodities with Russia.

"6. The Conference considers that the coöperative organizations of Russia can make themselves responsible for the reëstablishment of trade with Russia only in so far as they will not encounter insurmountable difficulties in the form of political conflicts, in the settlement of which Russian Coöperation, being a politically neutral economic organization, can take no part."

Atrocity stories were the usual newspaper diet about Russia. Few of them, however, printed this statement by two commissioners of the Chekho-Slovak government:

"The unbearable situation in which our army has been placed compels us to appeal to the Allies with a request to advise us how the Slovak army may secure safety and free return to the Motherland, which had already been decided upon with the consent of all Allied Powers.

"By guarding the railroad and maintaining order in the country,

our army has been forced to act against its convictions and to maintain a state of absolute arbitrariness and lawlessness which now reigns here. Under the guard of the Slovak bayonets, the Russian troops commit crimes of which the whole civilized world would be terrified. The burning of villages, the murder of peaceful Russian inhabitants, executions *en masse* of hundreds of people of democratic convictions, as well as those whom they only suspect of political disloyalty, are occurring daily, and the responsibility for all these crimes before the court of all the peoples of the world will fall upon us, for, having sufficient military forces, we did not interfere with this lawlessness.

"Bringing all this to the knowledge of the Allied representatives whose true allies the Slovaks were and will be we consider it necessary to use every means in order to make it known to all peoples of the world how tragic is the moral situation in the Slovak army in Siberia and the reasons for this. We, ourselves, do not see any way out of this situation save that of our immediate repatriation from the country which has been entrusted to our guard, or rendering us free to act so that we might prevent lawlessness and crimes no matter from what source they may come."

General Gaida, the Chekho-Slovak commander, said:

"The Allies are doing Russia more harm than the Bolsheviki, and the sooner they leave the better will it be for Russia. All the Allies have done in Russia is to support black monarchy, Kolchak, Denikin, Yudenich, and the Atamans (Cossack commanders). Within a short time all Siberia west of Baikal will fall to the Bolsheviki and from the Baikal to the Pacific will be Japanese-dominated provinces controlled by the Atamans. The only people that can tie Russia together are those who are now known as Bolsheviki. They are not the Reds of the days of terror in European Russia, but there is to-day a national movement in Russia for a real democracy and the crude form in which it is being displayed now eventually will work itself out in a moderate social program."

CHAPTER VI

FACING BOLSHEVISM: THE FUTURE IN RUSSIA

"There is no harm in anybody thinking that Christ is in bread. The harm is in the expectation that He is in gunpowder." —Ruskin.

"If there be any among us who would wish to dissolve this Union or to change its republican form, let them stand undisturbed as monuments of the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it."
—Thomas Jefferson.

THE future of Russia cannot be separated from the future of the rest of the world. Sometimes I wish it could. It seems sad that this earth is doomed to become so uniform. Some of us have no desire to see the civilization of Chicago and Pittsburgh duplicated on the Volga. Steam has introduced uniformity on the earth. The best we can do is to refrain from spreading this uniformity by despotic means.

A Russian has not been like an American. For a thousand years he has been developing qualities (faults and virtues) that are different from ours. The typical, the predominating Russian is a peasant.

He lives on a vast, flat plain. There in his little village, the center of a few farms, he has been exposed to many dangers and difficulties,—to storms, invasions, want, oppression. The resulting spirit has not been separate individualism, like that of our pioneers. It has been rather a community spirit, a tendency toward mutual reliance and mutual help. The lack of reading and the lack of new business undertakings have probably played their part in this communistic tendency. When everybody reads, and knows about other parts of the world, and when big enterprises tempt young men away, we may see a history much like that of the western capitalistic nations. Up to now the nature of the life on the Russian plain has brought about a mutual trust and reliance of which we know nothing. It not unfrequently shows itself in touching ways. Perhaps landlords are unfair, to such an extent that the farmers in a certain little village decide to move. They select one of their number to find a new abode. They tell him to go somewhere where the sky and the earth meet; or to the Chinese paradise; or to the Place Where No One Knows Where It Is. He may be gone a year, but he always comes back. The money of the villagers is never used by him to disappear and live in comfort. Or a young man in the village kills another. The peasants decide that it is too bad he should be banished, being a young

man with a family, and not a criminal at heart. It would be much better for another man to meet the requirements of the national criminal law. So a delegation goes to Old John and explains the harmfulness of having the young man punished. "You, John, on the other hand, have no one depending on you, and you have but five or six years to live. You might as well spend them in Siberia as anywhere else. You tell the authorities that you committed the murder."

And John does it.

In less poetic ways the affairs of the village are constantly determined by informal conference. If an oppressive law is passed, it is not by each man's deciding for himself that the situation is met, but by talking it over and seeking the opinions of those most trusted. In business affairs also the problems were long ago met in the same spirit of village community. The habit of general coöperation made natural the growth of coöperatism, if we use that word for actual coöperative associations, and the Russians, so far behind in competitive and capitalistic business, have in their own way as striking a record in coöperative business as England or Denmark. When Russia entered the great war in 1914 her transport, her food supply, her manufacturing soon showed their utter inadequacy to conduct modern war against Germany. The forces that stepped in to

fill the gap were the coöperative associations, the cottage industries, and the local political bodies, the zemstvos. As Russia faces another series of crises to-day, now that the frank interference of the Entente is ended, and that there is no appreciable civil war, it is again to the spirit of coöperation, the habit of coöperation, and the existing great coöperative associations that those who know Russia look with most hope. Danger will not for a long time be ended. It is impossible that Russia should work out smoothly a system of political life in a short time, and it is too much to hope that the nations dominated by modern capitalistic ideas will let her alone to make her way, without maneuvers on their part based on fear and on the excessive desire for material gain. The desire to make money out of legitimate trade is one of the safest and most useful desires in a complex world, but the attempt to get every kind of concessions, backed by political pressure, may well bring us trouble. This usual difficulty will be complicated by foreign alarm at such experiments in socialism or semi-socialism as the Russians may choose to make. As to concessions already obtained, the evidence that has come to me about the Japanese confirms the following statement by M. Paul S. Reinsch, formerly our minister to China:

"As time went on several matters became quite

clear. The expectation that large bodies of Russian troops would flock to the support of the Kolchak government was disappointed. An army was indeed collected, but it did not make a reassuring impression upon observers. It seemed to be lacking in spirit and earnestness, and the officers were observed to give most of their attention to champagne and general high living. Vodka, interdicted in Russia, was set free by the Siberian government. Admiral Kolchak himself, indeed, and several of his official advisers continued personally to command confidence and respect, but they did not find real popular support.

"It has also become clear that the Japanese were attempting to use the joint intervention for strengthening their own purpose of gaining special interests in Siberia. Suspicion was particularly aroused by their relations with General Semyonov. When the support which Great Britain and France had originally given this leader came to an end, Japanese assistance continued, though it was out of line with the Allies' general desire of giving the Kolchak government a chance to establish itself. It is understood that various agreements were made by Japanese with the Cossack leaders, for the granting of mineral and other concessions as a return for financial support. Such matters are generally carried out by agents who act in their personal capacity

without formal authorization by their government and whose work may be either ignored or acknowledged when the time is ripe. A striking case of this method occurred in the negotiations of Nishihara at Peking. The existence of his proposals was stoutly denied by the Japanese authorities, but the results were ratified the moment they had completely matured. For this reason it is entirely impossible to know the extent of concessions sought or obtained by Japanese individuals or companies, and the relation of the latter to the government."

Here is an extract from the Japanese paper Kokumin, in the fall of 1919:

"With the bravery of our gallant troops it would not be so very difficult for us to clear Siberia of the Bolsheviki, and once Japan is successful in uniting all of Siberia, we shall then have before us the opportunity of exploiting the gold deposits which are so abundant in that country, and of developing the timber resources and the industries, in coöperation with the Russian population. It is, however, important to bear in mind that Japanese policies in Siberia should be dictated by consideration of our own interests, and that we should give no special consideration either to Semyonov or to any other leader. We need only utilize their individual services if they contribute to the promotion of our own interests."

Professor Reinsch, whose study of the situation has been free and large, after discussing the business

outlook, says of the Russians that "we should not be behindhand in securing our just part in coöperating with the Russian people in the great constructive era which lies ahead. As far as concerns their social and political problem we can have only one wish—that the institutions finally evolved may be in harmony with the national genius of Russia." General Smuts, in his notable farewell to the British people, at the time of his return to South Africa, gave eloquent expression to a similar view, and hazarded the suggestion that the form of government ultimately most congenial to the Russian genius might turn out to be some purified form of Soviet system. The number of western statesmen who will look at Russian developments with this olympian calm, however, is not large, and part of the educational task of the present and the future is to induce a more tolerant attitude toward whatever new experiments in government that country may undertake.

The response to the proposed raising of the blockade against Soviet Russia was not such as to encourage the belief that the policy of not interfering with the course of evolution will be genuine. Those newspapers that most inevitably represent average conventional opinion were filled, in their editorials and in letters from excited correspondents, with warnings about the terrible consequences of allowing free intercourse. They viewed with alarm, they

spoke of honor and sanity and patriotism, they pasted onto any peace offer from the Soviet government the good old labels, left over from the war against Germany, such as peace-offensive, insidious propaganda, and their fellows. They pointed out unceasingly that the coöperative associations were mere tools of the Bolsheviks, that the Narodny Bank had been nationalized, that if any material necessary to the revival of Russia were allowed to enter nobody would get any of it except Bolsheviks. Throughout the unhappy trouble our relief organizations seemed to be gravely concerned with the danger that some baby living within Lenin's jurisdiction might get something to eat.

It happened that on the morning of March 11, 1920, I read but two newspapers. One of them, The World, had been in its editorials, and particularly in its news, more intelligent on Russia than most American papers. Each of them contained a letter against the policy of having the outside governments finally drop the policy of interfering in the ordinary relations between their citizens and Russia. The letter to the Times was from Montgomery Schuyler, formerly in our embassy in Petrograd, who had been devoting himself ardently to protecting his country from the loss of respect that would be implied in the government's letting the people alone. He said:

"The significance of the Bolshevist 'peace drive,' as I see it, is that the tremendous military machine built up by the Bolsheviki is breaking up from internal weakness and its leaders realize that the blood lust which has characterized their campaign for the last two years has overshot the mark. The Bolshevist leaders realize they are sitting on a volcano and that they are under the suspicion of the world.

"It should be borne in mind that the State Department has not received the 'peace offer' dated Moscow, Feb. 24, and signed by Chicherin, People's Commissary for Foreign Affairs, which the Soviet authorities claim to have transmitted formally to Washington.

"The fact, as pointed out in a Washington dispatch, that Chicherin is now making a special request that publicity be given to this so-called offer of peace to a country which is not, and has not, been at war with Russia indicates that the Bolshevist Government is more interested in reaching the American people through the press for its own ends than in getting any action from our Government.

"Due to conditions of unrest and the high cost of living throughout the world, there is a movement to reopen trade with Russia. Viewed from a strictly economic angle the United States is not called upon to join this movement, because its own resources make it independent of Russia, and morally it would be impossible to do so.

"This is entirely aside from the loss of self-respect which we would sustain in entering into negotiations with criminals whom I regard as unworthy of a place in the councils of the nations."

The letter on the same day in the World was from Erving Winslow. It said:

"Setting aside the 'academic' theorists who reck so little what their views might bring about in the way of world-wide disaster if fulfilled, like Messrs. Robins, Bullitt, Hapgood, et al., there is Lloyd George, for instance, who deliberately incurs the menace of freeing an indorsed propaganda of anarchy, through a 'recognition' of the authors and promoters of it, because his political power may be continued by thus obeying the mandate of masses of his constituents. Here in America it is 'trade hunger' that blinds some worthy men (along with some not so worthy) to the dreadful consequences of promoting commercial relations with Soviet Russia, while professing hatred of its 'madness and ravaging,' which, of course, would mean and be 'recognition,' indorsing its policy in the eyes of its own slaves and prolonging its power at home and abroad.

"The Post has printed an appeal from the 'New York agent of the Moscow Narodny Bank,' which may be quite sincere but should have been captioned 'Advertisement,' since the bank has been taken over by the Soviets, for whose interest, or perhaps for certain interests of greed among short-sighted selfish men of 'business' Mr. Sherman writes.

"Trade is doubtless a mighty conqueror, but it is only 'free trade' which has been claimed as a direct moral agent by its advocates, with whom 'love,' not 'business success,' is the ideal—'omnia vincit amor.' The 'ideal,' fortunately, as a practical motive, still survives the war with us, and is preventing America (by encouraging or allowing

trade) from 'recognition' of a tyranny which has 'abolished God' and the basic principle of democracy—religious toleration—persecuting, torturing and murdering its wretched victims for their religious beliefs. Now it is not only in the spirit of Him who said, 'Get thee behind me, Satan'—when the 'world' power which lies in trade was offered Him—that the refusal should be plain and positive, but for a practical goal which has not yet been envisaged—the rising up en masse of once 'Holy Russia' for its own liberation.

"Is it not worth a trial, say, Catholic, Protestant, Jew or moralist—all who love their fellow-men?"

Such, unhappily, is the quality of thought and information that we have to deal with. Shortly before these particular examples struck my eye it happened that a certain gentleman, whose letters appear with comic frequency in the New York newspapers whenever there is danger of peace with Russia, and who is supposed to be supported by money lent by the United States to the Kerenski government, was boasting that to him belonged the chief credit for making Mr. Berkenheim's trip to the United States in 1919 a failure. He remarked incidentally that Mr. Berkenheim was all kinds of a crook, who had betrayed everybody with whom he had been associated. As the group that talks and writes like this has been supported by American money, the sharper light thrown on their methods the better. Mr. Berkenheim's statesmanlike career

in the service of his country has brought him attacks from all factions that have tried in vain to use him. Before the rebellion of 1905 he had become the acknowledged leader of the coöperative movement in Russia. As an individual he belonged to the Socialist Revolutionary party, which brought about that rebellion. The leaders of his party endeavored to induce him to involve the coöperative associations in the rebellion. He firmly maintained that the great value of the coöperatives would be destroyed if their proper business became entangled with politics, and for this stand he was charged with disloyalty by his party associates. He entered the Kerenski government, but again refused to influence the coöperative associations to strengthen that government by entering party politics. Again he was charged with disloyalty by those who cannot see beyond politics. Kerenski fell, the Bolsheviks came in, and the biggest coöperative associations stood with their clear record of non-political production and distribution, a record which they might well have lost with less wise leadership at the top. The Bolsheviks nationalize them on paper, but even in the present dark situation it is not impossible they may fail to absorb them in actual practice. What our standpat propagandists, those who describe the Kolchak and Denikin and Yudenich forces as the "loyal" Russians, will be busy about for a long time

is interfering with the attempt of various great patriotic, industrious, and representative bodies to work out the economic salvation of Russia and gradually to settle their relations to whatever government exists or may exist. A momentous danger lies in the interference from outside busybodies who find the solace to their pride and their antagonism in sowing misrepresentation and distrust and in creating artificial obstacles to any progress by conciliation, compromise and coöperation.

Most of the talk in this country about forcible nationalization of industry in Russia took no account of the shadings, difficulties, and tendencies. We said simply, for example, that the Narodny bank has been nationalized. The facts are these: The Narodny bank, as the central bank of the Cooperatives, was treated in a way significantly different from the other banks. The decree was dated Dec. 6th, 1918. The terms provided for:

1. The transformation of the M.N.B. from an independent organization into the Coöperative Section of the People's Bank of the Socialist Republic of Soviets.
2. The abolition of the share capital of the Bank as such, the shareholders becoming creditors of the Bank and a current account being opened to each of them to the amount representing the value of the shares held.
3. The appointment of the Board of the Bank by

its shareholders, or, to give them their new title, its creditors, subject to the Board being approved by the Central Board of "The People's Bank."

In all other respects the Bank was to retain its independence and to carry on its work without any interference from outside.

In commenting on this decree, the Russian Co-operator at the time remarked that: "only time will show whether these privileges are to be respected by the present masters of Russia, or whether they are merely the thin end of the wedge, which will establish a much sterner form of nationalization."

And that was for many months the central question between the Bolshevik government and the co-operatives. The spirit was one that cannot be grasped by those who insist on making a clear, sharp issue. Both sides were trying to find a way. The coöperatives did not wish to oppose the political principles of the de facto government, and the more intelligent elements in the government feared that it could not eradicate coöperation without destroying production. The tone was justly represented by this summary of the situation from the Russian Coöperator for March, 1920:

"We shall not attempt to dwell here on the question whether the treatment . . . was dealt out by the Soviet authorities to the two most important

branches of our movement out of hostility to co-operation on principle, or out of a, let us admit, natural and quite justifiable desire to make coöperation fit into the structure of a new social order evolved by the present Government of Russia, and conform to the general economic line of policy laid down by them. We can only place on record the fact that serious attempts were made, for one reason or another, to deprive the coöperative organizations of Russia of their previous independence and make them serve the interests of the State, as understood by the leaders of the Soviets. On the other side, it must be recorded that, as far as the results of this policy were concerned, it appeared at that time that the opposition of coöperation, coupled with its economic importance, compelled the authorities to proceed slowly and cautiously, and that our movement was able to adapt itself to the new conditions, and retain a large measure of its former freedom of action and independence. This is a fact on which all witnesses from Soviet Russia are agreed.

"The policy of compromises thus pursued by the Soviets towards the coöperative organizations was undoubtedly dictated in the first instance by the economic importance of the latter, especially in a country torn asunder by civil war and with an economic system which had, even in the words of Lenin, gone to pieces. This fact manifests itself particularly in the attitude adopted by the Government of the Soviets toward the various branches of Agricultural Coöperation.

"We know, for instance, that in the same month which witnessed the nationalization of the Moscow Narodny Bank the Soviets approved the organiza-

tion of a new important society of Agricultural Co-operation, namely, the 'Selskosoyus.' Since then, according to all information which has reached us, the Selskosoyus acts on behalf of the Government in various capacities, and is entrusted by them with the purchase and distribution of various agricultural implements and materials.

"Similarly, the food control authorities work in the same way with the coöperative societies, which have emerged from the Goods Department of the Moscow Narodny Bank, which have their place officially assigned to them in the system of State control, and are acting as a link between the authorities and the producers.

"In summarizing the information which we possess about the recent position of our movement in Soviet Russia, we can say that two facts stand out clearly.

"Firstly, while it is undoubtedly true that co-operation has been, to one degree or another, deprived of its independence, the coöperative organizations were not, however, destroyed or superseded, but were made parts of the State machinery, and made use of in order to carry out the policy and aims of the new economic system proclaimed in Russia.

"Secondly, in the whole of their dealings with coöperation the Soviets have manifested a certain degree of tolerance, and have afforded to it some privileges which they never thought of conferring upon private capital.

"The questions remain: How far has the process of extending the principles of nationalization to co-operation gone at present? How far has the policy

of ruthless nationalization and control gained the upper hand over the tolerance towards, and recognition of, the economic importance of coöperation?

"Whatever be the reply to these questions, we are convinced that in the struggle for the right to serve the interests of the masses the coöperative idea will emerge as the more successful and preferable."

The coöperators, in short, mean to exercise patient, passive resistance to any interpretation of nationalization that takes away spontaneity, self-management, the soul of coöperation, but they do not intend, if they can avoid it, to be drawn into political opposition. Lenin said in December, 1918:

"The government of the Soviets, while not departing from its position of irreconcilable struggle against imperialism and capitalism, sees itself nevertheless compelled to recognize the immediate importance of an agreement with the coöperative movement. The Soviets have arrived at the period of reconstruction when the efforts of all laboring classes are required, and the experience and knowledge of the coöperative organizations especially can prove a valuable support for this task. It has for a long time been the aim of the Soviet Government to call on all the coöperative forces to join the work of the restoration of the economic life of the country, which aim it is attempting to carry out now."

The attempt of the government to transform the Centrosoyus, or central consumers' association, into the food distributing branch of the government, showed itself in a decree of April 12, 1919, but the masses do not like the idea and the decree is likely in the long run to prove a paper decree, as far as actual operation goes. The officials appointed by the government watch and control the work, which, however, is in part managed by former directors and managers chosen by the coöperatives themselves. This compromise, of course, was not entirely satisfactory either to the coöperators or to the communists, but it was a genuine effort on both sides to help the Russian people. It was upset largely by outside political propaganda, treating trade with the coöperatives as a move against the Soviet government. The situation was described by Mr. Sherman, of the Narodny Bank, in the Socialist Review for March:

"All other branches of coöperation, especially the powerful Central Producers' Associations, never were and are not now nationalized. The Central Flax Growers' Association, the All-Russian Agency of Agricultural Coöperation, 'Selskosoyus,' the Potato Union, the Coöperative Grain and the Central Association of Food Growers and 'Kustarsbyt,' continue their usual work. While private insurance companies have been abolished in Soviet Russia, the coöperatives created the All-Russian Insurance

Union in which the Bolshevist authorities themselves have insured all the cattle of the country. Thus the nationalization of coöperation is at most only partial, but actually it is rather formal, not really affecting the independent coöperative work. This does not mean that the coöperatives are acting in bad faith or are in reality enemies of the Bolsheviki under the disguise of being friends. The coöperators never professed to be their friends nor are they by any means their enemies. The coöperators are friends of the population and enemies of the competitive industrial system. They are serving the population and are loyally continuing to serve it even under most trying conditions imposed upon them by the Bolsheviki. As the spokesman of the 'Centrosoyus,' A. V. Merkulov, expressed it at a coöperative conference in Moscow: 'Our aim is to safeguard as far as possible the self-activity and independence of coöperation and to soften the decrees in so far as they violate these principles,' and that is the only proper attitude for the coöperatives towards any decree to which they are opposed.

"It is not the business of coöperators to express a judgment as to the political value and significance of Sovietism. The coöperators are anti-Bolshevik to the very extent to which the Bolsheviki are anti-coöperators. Their resistance is as small or as great as the pressure exerted upon them."

I think it is perfectly clear that if the Bolsheviks push the coöperators too hard the Bolsheviks will thereby insure their fall, but that if they are tactful with them they may succeed in working out a compromise between their own doctrines and the

peasants' traditional methods of acting that may have decided advantages over unmitigated capitalism. The reason that the coöperatives have been able to retain in part the essentials of liberty is simple. The prime fact has been that the people as a whole would not do efficient work for the government, but that they would continue to work for themselves and for their coöperative associations. Also private commerce went on, usually but not always at such a profit as rightly to be called profiteering. A significant example of the national psychology is the way the peasant managed his grain. In order to keep the government from taking it away from him he stored it without threshing it. The government kommissar, unable to carry it away without threshing it for himself, let it alone. The private trader, on the other hand, brought the peasant something he needed, an agreement was reached, and the two set to work and together threshed the amount to be paid for. Russia is an enormous place, which goes on living, with little relation to politics. When the Communist government does undertake to nationalize the coöperative associations, what happens? It will probably differ much in different localities. The following illustration was given to me by one of the parties to the transaction. One day a local kommissar turns

up at a coöperative plant, and the following conversation occurs:

Kommissar: "Are you Comrade Ivanov (the manager)?"

Manager: "Yes, and who are you?"

Kommissar: "I am Kommissar Pavlov, sent to exercise control here."

Manager: "Well, what are you going to do?"

Kommissar: "For one thing, I am going to look around and see that no political activities are going on."

Manager: "All right. Fine. Go ahead."

Kommissar: "Also I want to see your papers."

They are turned over to him. In a day or two he brings them back. "I don't understand anything in all this," he says. The only thing that happens is that he writes his name on certain papers which he thinks important, to go through the farce of pretending that he is conducting the business. The coöperatives go on as usual.

A serious interference has been requisition. This is annoying and causes some loss, but it has not been confined to the Bolsheviks. There have been requisitions by General Semyonov, General Horvath, General Khomyakov, Admiral Kolchak, requisitions by local soviets, requisitions by hoodlums, and requisitions by the Moscow Central Government. When the government requisitions a cer-

tain amount of food it pays less for it than the co-operatives receive when they sell it elsewhere. This has been an annoyance, but not sufficient in amount to keep the coöperative members from being satisfied to go on working.

In considering the probable future relations in Russia between the government and the producing organizations we must take as one of the most important premises the fact that the Bolsheviks have so far found communistic production a failure. Karl Marx has broken down in the face of human nature. The Bolshevik technical publications themselves show it. Take the following, for example, from the New Way, one of the economic publications, reproduced in Soviet Russia for March 27, 1920:

"The causes indicated influence the general decline in the productivity of labor in the following proportions:

(1) Weakening of the organism and the poorest state of health	44%
(2) Relaxation of working discipline	20%
(3) Introduction of the daily wage	19%
(4) Poor working organization	6%
(5) Diminution in the quality of the basic materials	6%
(6) Wear and tear of machines	5%
Total	100%

"The action of the second, and that of the third and fourth of these causes are closely connected. As is proved by the experience of these last months, the simple return to piece payment led at once to an improvement in the discipline and the organization of work. Every violation of order which hinders the effective execution of the common work is checked at its source. Thus at the factory of Putiloff the following case occurred. Through lack of attention the firemen had permitted a low pressure of steam in the boiler, thus slowing up the machines. The workers at once went in search of those responsible, and, revolver in hand, forced them to work, as far as that was physically possible."

The admitted falling off in the productiveness of the industries managed by the government has been offset by the increased efforts of small industry, some of it strictly private, winked at by the authorities, and much of it the growth of the coöperative and semi-coöperative industries. A serious student of these matters will give careful attention to some figures collected by the zemstvos, showing the relations between big and little industry in 1918 as compared with 1908. The contrast would be still more striking to-day if we could get the figures, for the small industries have been growing and the large, government-controlled industries have deteriorated a great deal in the last two years:

TABLE OF PRODUCTIVITY FOR TEN-YEAR PERIOD

General Classification of Industries	SMALL INDUSTRIES *For 34 Provinces* Millions of Gold Roubles 1908	SMALL INDUSTRIES *For 34 Provinces* Millions of Gold Roubles 1918	BIG INDUSTRIES Millions of Gold Roubles 1908	BIG INDUSTRIES Millions of Gold Roubles 1918
FIBER—				
Spinning	6	47	351	216
Weaving	66	333	791	483
Felt footwear	14	73	5	5
Rope-making	3	18	10	7
Lace-making, etc.	11	185	43	30
Tailoring, hat-making	38	110	7	4
WOOD PRODUCTS—				
Wood-sawing	2	37	90	62
Boxes, trunks	1	7	2	2
Cooper work	5	54	3	3
Carriage-making wagons, wheels	9	76	0.2	0.4
Tables, furniture, floors	9	48	13	14
Basketry	9	153	0.2	0.9
Turners' work	3	46	2	2
Musical instruments, etc.	1	5	10	6
METAL—				
Agricultural machinery and implements	3	12	27	19
Locks, horseshoes, surveyors' instruments	37	119	71	38
MINERAL—*Total*	7	66	98	134
Pottery, porcelain, etc.	4	34	15	24
HIDES AND OTHER ANIMAL PRODUCTS—				
Hides	6	11	77	24
Sheepskins, furs	8	31	4	2
Footgear	62	150	13	9
Fur coats, gloves	1	6	0.4	0.2
Harness	2	7	6	4

For detailed narrative of the growth of coöperative industry in Russia during the war I must refer to Chapter VIII. Here it may be said that the Czar's government distrusted the self-governing, indus-

trial, coöperative efforts of the people, but found itself compelled, in time of stress, to rely on them; and everything indicates that we are going to see the story continue under whatever government may evolve in Russia. Industry will probably never be capitalistically as despotic as it has been with us, and also it will probably never yield to the opposite despotism of complete centralized state management. To work out the most satisfactory type of civilization, industrial and political, will be the task of the Slav genius. What should lead us to imagine that our interference can help? We are seeking paths away from the exaggerations of private capitalism. We are endeavoring to socialize our civilization. The Bolsheviks started at the other end. They began with a doctrinaire plan of complete socialization. They, or their successors, must find paths away from their extreme, to let in the freedom desired by men. Possibly in the end these two movements, opposite in direction, may find their rest somewhere near the same place.

CHAPTER VII

IS SOCIALISM NEEDED?

"We are all Socialists now."
Sir William Vernon Harcourt.

"If every just man that now pines with want
Had but a moderate and beseeming share
Of that which lewdly pampered Luxury
Now heaps upon some few with vast excess,
Nature's full blessings would be well dispensed."
Comus.

IT was in 1888 that Sir William Vernon Harcourt spoke the words quoted above. Socialism is one of those words that easily mean anything, from Harcourt's liberalism to Bill Haywood's dictatorship of the proletariat. When I was a boy, the very word was spoken in hushed tones. It was sure to startle and alarm. It is still in bad standing with us, but in Europe there is likely to be more enlightenment in the socialist parties than in the others. Those parties that call themselves by some other name take positions that nearly all prosperous Americans would call socialistic. Lord Robert Cecil is the essence of Toryism at its best, but when he comes out for a partnership be-

tween labor and capital he means a real partnership; he is too honest a man to mean a trick. England leads the world in studying the problem of industrial relations. She has long led in political evolution, and we may find her aristocrats taking as enlightened a part in this new emancipation as they have taken in the political changes.

The war has shown to the working people of the European belligerents something they cannot forget. In their striving against the sabotage of capital they have been met with certain words, decade after decade, in which they knew there was no meaning, but they had not the power to expose the emptiness of the argument. The war has made the exposure. How sacred was the talk about the impossibility of doing business without a profit, and how little the words were understood. Since the war the expression has a meaning still, but a meaning profoundly different. Fully as clearly as before we know that a factory which does not produce with efficiency things that men and women need is destructive; but we likewise understand, much more clearly, that a capitalist who can make what he calls a profit only by keeping his men unemployed a third of the time is flagrantly destructive.

How much it is his fault, and how much it is the fault of capitalist society, is not relevant to the socialist argument. The point is that all the sabot-

age ever charged against labor is little compared to the habitual sabotage of capitalistic society: that is to say, the loss of product due to conducting the world's business from other motives than these:

1. To produce primarily things that are needed.
2. To produce them uninterruptedly.
3. To distribute them equitably.

How was it possible to carry on the war so much longer than our economic experts told us it could be carried on? Precisely by conducting business on these principles. We produced what for war-time we needed: *there is no reason why in peace time we should not produce what is needed. We kept production going less exclusively than formerly in accordance with its effect on John Smith's shares of stock, more according to our need of the product.* Many luxuries and the advertising that sells them were diminished. Distribution tended also to be regulated according to the need. The whole idea of the equal necessity of the capitalist with the laborer received a blow. We had state socialism in all the warring countries, and in those countries that brought the heaviest force to bear—Germany, England, France—the importance of labor was seen, whereas the control of business by the capitalist was largely pushed aside. "You may stay where you are," the governments said, "in so far as you are expert managers, and will work under our

orders, but in so far as you claim arbitrary command because of something you call stock, you interfere with efficiency and will kindly step to the rear. After the war you may begin to rule again, and use your words 'can' and 'cannot,' and 'profit' and 'loss,' because we do not take peace seriously; but in war we have no time to be bothered with your dialect."

American business men talk more about the necessity of increasing production than they talk about the difference between producing luxuries and producing necessities. Capitalists are praised as creative, imaginative, and socially useful because they increase the amount of wealth engaged in reproduction, regardless of whether the increased effort means putting more labor on the things we need or more labor on the things we might better do without.

The capitalists try to meet this war demonstration by talking about the burden of debt and our having lived on capital during the war, but after legitimate concession is made to this answer the socialist position remains difficult to meet. What values were destroyed? Human lives, human limbs, roads, bridges, villages, soils, factories: all of these are tangible, though on the material side there is to be offset the saving of five years in les-

sened luxury and in increased effort, serious attention, and resourcefulness.

We may leave out for the present the loss through disorganization, as whether that fluidity is to give us gain or loss rests on decisions still to be made.

We come then to the loss represented by debt. What can this represent in addition to the tangible losses already mentioned? From the point of view of society as a whole, nothing. We have certain interesting implications and promises, regarding the distribution of our future production, and regarding the continuity of our promises to repay those whose earnings were used in the war; but it is wholly impossible, by any subtlety, to increase the loss to society as a whole by metaphysical financial conceptions. Stocks and bonds and notes represent objects. When we know how many objects and persons have been destroyed, we know the gross loss; and whether the net loss almost equals the gross, or whether it is much smaller, or does not exist, is to be decided by the political and social occurrences of the new few years.

Prince Lvov, head of the Russian provisional government, made a very interesting statement about the effect of the war on the masses, in Struggling Russia, March 6, 1920:

"The magnitude of the unfolding struggle turned out to be beyond the power of the mechanisms of

State. The nations themselves, with their whole organisms, were dragged into the struggle. The mechanisms lagged behind, were shaken up and weakened, while the masses were found to be ahead of them, and grew strong and powerful. As a result, Democracy was the victor on all fronts. In the hearts of Democracy in all warring countries a feeling of triumph grew up through the realization of the sacrifices that had been made, the blood that had been shed, and the righteousness of its cause. Upon the fields of battle, as well as upon the peaceful wheat stretches of Russia, within her industrial and state establishments, the masses suddenly began to realize their solidarity and their strength, and they understood that they had gone into the trenches and perished for the preservation of an order which, while ready to cede to them Heaven, would not give up even a part of the Earth. A new international front, the front of the world proletariat against the bourgeoisie, was suddenly formed. Its platform is the inequalities produced by civilization and its enemies are the state and capital. Upon its banner are inscribed promises of worldly goods, money and a hazy idea of communism, the road to which is mapped out through the destruction of the old state organisms. Russian Bolshevism has amputated with an axe the vicious ulcers of civilization. But together with the sore spots it has also cut out an enormous part of the living body of the people, it has crippled it and has brought it near death. But the powerful organism of Russia will conquer. Even under the new environs it is gaining back its living strength. The old abyss is gone, the peasant masses are pros-

pering, the land is in the hands of the toilers, and its just distribution depends upon the will of the people. The nationalities of Russia have become autonomous and the doors to the free cultural development of national life and true popular government have been opened."

If the socialist position, in so far as it criticizes the capitalist system, has been strengthened by the war, its extremer boasts about what it can do itself have received blows. Its Marxian formulas have been made ridiculous. In all countries, along with the necessity of government control of key industries, of distribution and consumption, have been shown the inconveniences and limitations of all those things. The human soul has revolted against such centralized control. Life has looked like slavery. Masses of bureaucrats have annoyed us and reminded us of Prussia. The gain in production brought about by state control has been partly offset by various inefficiencies of state execution. That orthodox Marxism has lost by the war is as clear as that the socialist idea in its less schematized and more vital forms has gained. Not only has the idea of an all-interfering bureaucracy become more vivid in its unpleasantness, but there has been brought into relief a fundamental false assumption of Marx, that men would tend to become clearly divided into proletarians and capitalists. Obviously from four-fifths to nine-tenths of the people in the

United States are capitalists, a condition Marx never looked forward to. It is not only every man who owns a house, a farm, a bond, or a bank deposit, who is a capitalist. In the sense of having an interest against a theoretical and sudden leveling, every man is a capitalist who is able to do more in his present position than he would be confident of doing after a revolution. An energetic young American carpenter starting out in life is in opportunity and spirit a capitalist. If we accept the favorite socialist test, therefore, and leave out every standard except the economic—leave out the glory of whim and the dull weight of standardization—even so, while a large percentage of Americans stand to win from radical reforms, a large four-fifths also stand to lose by an experiment that endangers every established individual stake. For revolution, therefore, in the sense of violence and theoretical completeness there can be in our country but a small minority, and those Reds will be powerless unless the Blacks are so powerful and so stupid that the moderates between are helpless. In a relentless fight between the Reds alone and the Blacks alone the Reds in the end will win. That is why recent victories of the Blacks in America are dangerous.

For socialism as a direction, rather than for socialism as a dogma, the war did two things. It

oriented the western labor forces and it affected the moral sense of the world. These two things will remain true long after the present reactionary wave in America has spent its force.

The war oriented the western labor forces and it thus organized the western revolution, because it has thrown light upon these things:

(1) Upon the capitalistic origins of modern war.

(2) Upon the capitalistic nature of the peace.

(3) Upon the capitalistic hypocrisy of most of the war statements of the ruling class in every country.

(4) Upon the capitalistic bitterness with which the Czarist Russians were supported, not for love of them, but from hatred of the communists. A country was fought because of its form of government; every weapon, trick, and lie was used against it; the League of Nations was poisoned at its birth; the Holy Alliance was almost equalled as a solid phalanx in defense of existing economic institutions; a blockade was conducted which to starvation added explicitly the prevention of persons or correspondence passing to and fro. When crimes are to be perpetrated the perpetrators prefer the dark. If the governments of the world had sat up nights seeking a method of proving to liberal labor everywhere the savage purpose by which the ruling class is guided, they could not have selected conduct bet-

ter suited to burn it deep. I know that in my own acquaintance, among the more elastic-minded of my own age, and more particularly among the intelligent young, the Russian crime has held the first place in influence, while they have faced the great decision, whether to improve the existing system or to reform it out of existence.

The first point then, at which the socialist spirit, as contrasted with any dogma, has gained is in clearer knowledge of the blindness of existing governments, in clearer knowledge of their methods, and in awakened realization of the points at which communism is likely to fail. The second point, possibly even more important, is in *the change that has taken place in the center of gravity in political, social, and ethical thought.* This battle may be won or lost; we may pass into better periods or worse: but *inevitably and forever now the combat must rage around the economic rights of the majority.* The industrial conflict is as clearly unstoppable now as the political conflict was after 1688, 1775, and 1789. It is the consequence of harnessing steam and teaching men to read; of large-scale production, intricate communication, and universal thought. Why need we be alarmed over words on the one hand, or wedded to them on the other? In spite of its orthodox socialist planks, there have joined the British Labor Party many

men to whom the ideas of Karl Marx are nothing more than useful suggestions. They joined because the party's immediate program was in the right direction, and they would let the future take care of the later steps. It is in intellectual expertness, in insistence on those rights of labor that are demonstrated not only by reason but by experience, that socialism has won most in the war. That the purely orthodox, Marx-bible, Bolshevik brand has been discredited, except as a temporary violent remedy for a malignant disease, might have been shown far more strikingly if we had let the Russian experiment alone. Had it been let alone its failure on the economic side would have taught a much clearer lesson, because the reason for the failure would have been clear. It would have stood out unmistakably that Lenin and Bismarck are intellectual cousins; that paternalism, whether of the right or of the left, has its limits in nature; that a limitless bureaucratic control of life is objectionable to man. A person who reads Lenin's own speeches carefully has the most interesting demonstration of this truth. Our military interference, and later our blockade, obscured the lesson and gave the Bolsheviks plenty of excuses for the obvious fact that they held power only by suppressing the opposition press, preventing free assembly and discussion, and arresting as

counter-revolutionary almost anybody who was a candidate for any political position and was not a communist. Without our policy of fear and obscurantism and interference the Bolsheviks would have lost power in 1918 or 1919 or else have remained in power at the price of dropping their communism altogether except for control of a limited number of the necessities of life.

It will be fair, in connection with this statement about what would have happened, to meet the only plausible argument put forward by the blockadists and interventionists. It is like an argument discussed in another chapter. It is this: If stopping intervention and lifting the blockade works against Bolshevism, as is maintained by the liberals, why have the Bolsheviks striven for peace, and tried to have the blockade lifted? The answer is in part that the more desperately theoretical and uncompromising ones have not tried. Those who have been most eager to resume peaceable relations with the outside world have been the most intelligent ones, headed by Lenin, who realize that the experiment in pure communism is ended, and who prefer to face evolution, saving what they can of the revolutionary changes, rather than to seek prolongation of their arbitrary sway, at the cost of ruining Russia and in the end preparing for a reaction to the extreme right. This explanation may not pass with men

who believe that men like Lenin, Krassin and Lunacharski wear horns, but it will easily be understood by the more generous critics, who know that Lenin and some of his friends are many-sided men, regretting the sorrows of their country, and anxious to do the best they can in a difficult and contradictory world. Bolsheviks wished the blockade raised: so did anti-Bolsheviks, from Kerenski to Berkenheim. Both sides wished to help Russia and were willing to take some chances. The Russians who welcomed intervention and blockade were mostly expropriated aristocrats, who could hope little from any democratic government.

We can fairly, I think, sum up the great Russian experiment in socialism, as far as it has gone, in a few sentences. The peasant, who is Russia, preferred the communist despotism to reaction, and hence the armies opposing the Bolsheviks all disappeared. But this preference was relative. He did not enjoy being interfered with on his farm, any more than he enjoyed having his coöperative management interfered with. The Bolsheviks, when they came to power, promised the peasant three things. They promised him peace, land, and self-government. They could not give him peace, but he saw that the continuance of war was not the fault of the Bolsheviks. They tried to interpret

his ownership of land with communistic subtleties, which he calmly ignored, and took the land in sheer private ownership. They also tried to interpret self-government in terms of government by a few orthodox communists, but when the government tried to apply its doctrines by taking calves and wheat away from him he lost interest in its theories. He found ways of limiting the government's power to requisition but yet of continuing to produce more than his family ate, and trading the surplus for what he needed. From both fields of war-experience, then, we draw the same lesson. In the state socialism of the western powers at war and in the special theoretical experiment in Russia there is the clear answer of experience to communism, as far as the powers that rule us have permitted us to get the facts. The Marxians are strong as long as they are on the offensive. Their strength lies in the terrible injustices of the present system, which they point out, without wearying, year after year, and without successful contradiction. Their weakness is shown when they are put on the defensive. Then we see that no honeyed words can disguise the inherent evils of a vast bureaucracy. It has all the faults of size, the faults of government from the top, of over-government, and it goes against the deep-seated desire of men to work out their own destinies in a

thousand different ways of their own devising in groups that grow up to meet specific needs.

There are answers to the evils of capitalism, but there is no one answer.

CHAPTER VIII

THE ANSWER OF COOPERATION

"Why should one-half of the boots and shoes used in the United States be manufactured in the 1500 workshops of Massachusetts?"

Prince P. A. Kropotkin.

"Coöperation is the only immediate solution for the present industrial and farm unrest. Coöperation is probably the last orderly method by which the struggling masses of the country will seek relief from the present oppressive and unjust economic conditions. As American citizens who love our country, we are necessarily interested in securing relief in such a natural and orderly way."

C. H. Gustavson of the Nebraska Farmer's Union, 1920.

OF all the answers to the excesses and errors of private capitalism the one that is the most clearly worked out is the coöperative movement. It is also an answer that has gained in strength during the war. Not all of this war-gain will be held, by any means, because it resulted directly from war conditions, but on the other hand the movement has been growing with enough rapidity, over a long enough time, in va-

rious countries, to have proved its importance. In our country it is in its infancy, but there are already aspects of it that are significant, and there are some of the mistakes special to our development that might be better corrected by coöperative movements carried a long distance than in any other way. The ambitions of coöperation do not necessarily require what would be practically a new world, like complete state socialism, syndicalism, the full theory of guild socialism. Many coöperatives are socialists and many are not. Indeed to some it seems that it is in successful competition with capitalism, not in the effort to abolish it, that coöperation has succeeded; although this successful competition has had its distinct limits. If private capital should be abolished, coöperation in its present meaning also would cease to be. Those theories, therefore, which aim at ending capital are often hostile likewise to the coöperative movement. Robert Owen was a socialist but the whole history of the institutions of which he dreamed has been away from socialism in the complete national bureaucratic sense. As in all cases of this kind there are conflicting tendencies. There has been a close political alliance in Belgium between the socialist party and the coöperatives, but it is to be remembered that the Belgian socialists are essentially of the step-by-step kind, concerned with specific improvement and gen-

eral education rather than with the strictest Marxian orthodoxy. In France also there has been socialistic support for the coöperatives. In 1917 the British coöperatives established close relations with the Labor Party. These tendencies are not inconsistent with the fact that we see the majority of the Russian coöperatives feeling that if they are to be subjected, in their actual workings, to State Socialism, they will lose their reason for existence. The difference is not so much in the point of view of the coöperatives in the different countries as in the essentially different things that all go under the name of socialism. The orthodox socialist wishes the state to be everything. The syndicalist and the philosophic anarchist wish the state not to exist at all. The guild socialist reduces the state functions below what they are at present. Syndicalism and socialism are class movements. The coöperative movement, in the main, has been non-political. It has let philosophies of government alone and has undertaken to improve conditions inside of the existing framework. It has received its impulse from the labor class but it does not seek the triumph of one class over another.

Although the revival, in modern form, of the guild system has not taken on large proportions it is watched with much interest by the most intelligent students of industry. The so-called labor co-

operatives of Italy, making contracts with the government, are doing guild work. At Hull, England, this year, in a lock-out of painters, the workmen, independently of their employers, undertook operations directly. During this year also, at Manchester, guilds have been organized to meet the need of new housing. The new building guild has the approval of the unions. Here, as often in British labor progress, intellectuals took the lead. S. G. Hobson made the Manchester suggestion, and said it was an attempt "to marry the labor monopoly of the organized workers to the credit of the public authorities." Of the relation of the laborers to the municipality the leading writer on Guildism, G. D. H. Cole, says:

"The right course is for the two to strike a bargain. The workers supply, and collectively control, the labor, including the technicians and administrators, as well as the manual workers. The muncipality advances the money and takes the houses when they are finished. That is all that is required. As for the employer, he doesn't come in at all unless he gets a job as worker or manager under the guild.

"If the building workers can win industrial freedom and eliminate employers and private profit in this way, will they not be setting a fashion which other industries will be able to follow? This plan for a building guild is so essentially simple that every worker ought to be wondering why it never occurred to him before, and every one who, like

myself, has been theorizing about national guilds for years past ought to be ashamed of himself for having been content to theorize for so long."

To realize the fundamental difference between the coöperative movement and universal communism or strict Marxian socialism one need only fix his mind on the fact that one member of a coöperative association may own one share and another may own fifty. The one gets fifty times as much interest on his money as the other. Similarly with the saving distributed according to the amount purchased. There is no forced equality. The person who has bought the most goods in the course of the year gets the largest rebate. It is called profit, but actually it is merely a correction of the cost. Again in payment for work there is no attempt at uniformity, although the minimum wage principle owes much to coöperative example. Beyond the minimum necessity the more a person is supposed to be worth the more he is paid. Nevertheless the sympathy of moderate socialists is easily explicable, because what the coöperative system does tend to do is at every point to work against the exploitation of the consumer and the worker by the capital control. The consumer is the principal person considered, and the worker, employee or producer, within the consumer society, has had thus far little special representation, although his representation is likely

to increase. The bottom difference between the prevailing system and the coöperative system is that in the present system profit can be made by taking advantage of the needs of the consumer, whereas in a coöperative enterprise there is no exploiting profit. When there is a temporary shortage there will be an effort to end it, but there will be no increase in price unless a permanent increase is found in the cost. A general rise in wages will increase the cost price if it actually does increase the cost, which it may or may not do. A similar principle would apply to variations in the supply of raw materials, and to a changing proportion of producers to consumers.

The general principle of increased control by labor is more easily introduced into coöperative enterprise than into those controlled by private capital, since there are no such sharply conflicting motives. The control by the members is democratic in its nature, and the employees can easily become members. One share of stock, as far as control goes, gives as much power as a thousand. The Swiss are introducing workshop committees into their cooperative associations. The movement represented by the Whitley report is not likely to find serious obstacles in coöperative organizations. The representation of the producers in the great consumers' associations must not, however, be compared with

any such ideal as is represented either by syndicalism or by guild socialism, where the producer claims the entire or predominating control, regardless of the interests of the consumer. Nor must it be confused with the question of those producing associations, coöperative in name, which exist for the purpose of making a profit, in the ordinary sense, for the members, in the open market, and therefore are not coöperative at all in the sense of the coöperative movement. Inside the coöperative movement there are producing branches, but they produce only for members. The consumer is the person in control of this movement, but the degree of his sympathy with the producing laborer, as compared with the sympathy that private capital shows toward him, is illustrated by the fact that in many coöperative associations membership in a trade union is made compulsory among the employees. The difference in spirit is indicated from another angle in a remark by a laborer to Leonard S. Woolf,[1] one of the best known contemporary writers on coöperation: "Of course there's a difference between the relations of an employee to a capitalistic employer and those of an employee to a coöperative employer. The object of the first is to smash his employer, for the only way to argue with capitalism is to knock it on the head. But practically no coöperative employee wants to smash coöpera-

tion: it's almost as much in the interest of the employee to spread coöperation as it is in the interests of the coöperator."

It is easy to give misleading optimistic figures about the growth of the movement but the fairest British critics say that it has on the whole thus far succeeded only in the distributive trades, in banking and insurance, and in the manufacture of foodstuffs, clothing, furniture, and hardware. Of course these are all important branches of daily life, and American mothers should be interested in the fact that in Basle, Switzerland, coöperatives control the milk supply. To have milk controlled as it is with us is an absurd social crime. In many of the largest industries, such as transportation, mining, textiles, engineering, metal-working, and machine-making, little or nothing has been done by the co-operatives. The result is that, although in Great Britain the membership of the movement is over three and a half million the number of employees is less than one hundred and fifty thousand. Mr. Woolf, discussing the fact that for such reasons the employees will scarcely be able to exercise a great influence on the movement, goes on to say that for the workers actually to get control would be of very doubtful benefit, as the association would then cease to be primarily an association of consumers. "In form a consumer's

society, in practice it would be a producer's society, and immediately it would become subject to those dangers and diseases which have made the history of producers' coöperation largely a history of great hopes and repeated failures." In Mr. Woolf's opinion what has caused these failures is the break-down of discipline. It is one thing to give employees a very important voice: it is another thing to expect discipline to continue if they take orders from foremen and managers in the daytime and sit in judgment on them in the evening. We all know, since Taylor, how large a part of success and failure lies in management. This is not a reason for keeping the employee out of management. On the contrary, it is a reason for getting him in. Limitation is on such a kind and a degree of control as would mean that the interest of those in predominating control was stronger or more immediate in something else than it was in the ultimate success of the business. "It is here that time after time the self-governing workshop and the association of producers have broken down." The final problem, by no means yet worked out, is so to divide the power that all elements will be protected, and each element will be specially protected in those aspects with which it is particularly concerned.

In his pamphlet, "The Control of Industry by

Coöperatives and Trade Unionists," Mr. Woolf says:

"Many persons, seeing the appalling results of this system of production upon the wage-earning class, have jumped to the conclusion that the root of the system lies in the wage system. Abolish the wage system! is the cry. Two alternative systems which have been proposed are at the moment attracting much attention—Copartnership and Syndicalism. The idea in Copartnership is to give the workers a share in the profits, that share being invested in the capital of the business, so that the workers have a voice in the control of the business. Perfect Copartnership only exists where the whole capital of the business belongs to the workers in that business. This is coöperation of producers, and it exists and has proved successful in a few businesses such as the Equity Boot Works and Woodhouse Mills in England, and the famous iron works at Guise in France. There is no doubt that genuine Copartnership—where the worker really controls production—does protect the worker's interests. But it strikes at the root of Coöperative production by consumers. Copartnership produces for profit; we produce for use. At the root of our production lies the theory that consumers are the people who should have the right to say what ought to be produced. The Wholesale produces what it knows two and one-half million Coöperators want to use; a Copartnership concern produces what it thinks people in general will pay a certain price for.

"Syndicalism is a proposed form of production which has a certain likeness to Copartnership. Under Syndicalism, instead of each particular busi-

ness being in the control of the workers in that business, the whole of each trade would be in the control of the workers in that trade. Syndicalism is largely a revolutionary doctrine, a revolt against the tyranny of the capitalist system. It contains much of extreme interest and importance. It also contains many contradictory theories. In some forms it is scarcely distinguishable from trade unionism. But in its more advanced forms its aim is to organize the whole of production from the point of view of the workers as producers; while our aim is to organize some parts of production from the point of view of the workers as consumers. But while the basis of Coöperation and Syndicalism is different, there is no reason why they should not learn from each other, nor why a system of industry should not be evolved, in which consumers and workers are equally represented. This is not the place to discuss what the foundations of society would be in future."

If the coöperative movement is in its nature more democratic and more sound than unrestricted capitalism, state socialism, syndicalism, or guild socialism, the degree of importance which it will have in solving our industrial troubles will depend on its ability to increase in size. There are a number of countries in which it is already an important detail in life. There is one country, Russia, in which its part in national life became and may yet remain a major one, and its high importance is assured in Denmark. If it could grow until its rôle in the

national life of the principal countries was greater than that of capitalism for profit, the whole temper of the world would be changed. Such a growth may be improbable, but it is not impossible. Thus far it has had almost exclusively a working class membership, which of course has greatly limited its field. What it could produce has been limited by what its members could use. The future to which it may look forward must depend on whether the middle classes also go into it largely.

We must remember that coöperation is less than a century old and that its more rapid growth is comparatively recent. The little retail store at Rochdale was started in 1844 by 23 discouraged workingmen. To-day the British consumers' wholesale organizations are producing from 25 to 30 millions pounds of goods per year. The British mills at Manchester grind more than a million sacks of flour in a year. In Glasgow the coöperative bakery is the largest bakery in the world. There is enough foreign trade to have led the cooperatives to own their own ships. In Denmark it may fairly be said that coöperation has taken so large a part in the success of farming that it would be difficult to conceive of Danish life without it. It has almost all grown up since the war of 1864, from a felt need, and it has put the national industry, farming, on a high plane of success. Switzerland

is not only one of the countries where the institution of coöperation is most widely spread, but it has recently been adding new steps in its development, including courses in the University of Zurich for the education of managers and officials in coöperative enterprises.

Russia is undoubtedly, even beyond Denmark, the country where coöperation has played the largest part. It is not up to the Danish, British, or German standard in some respects, but it is ahead of all others in the degree to which it is accepted by the whole people. In Chapter VI there has been given a sketch of the spirit in which the movement has grown. The war saw a great extension. Industry was wholly unequal to the strain put on it, and the Czar's government turned to the zemstvos and the coöperatives to help. Big business, after the Bolshevik revolution, was operated by the government and went lamentably to pieces. Small business grew to take its place. Private small business was extensive, but profiteering in its methods. Only the coöperatives represented a large and honest and efficient working body. The figures are difficult, since there is so much overlapping, but it is probable that there were nearly fifteen millions of coöperators at the beginning of the war and that there were nearly twice that number by the beginning of 1920. A remarkable step was taken in 1918

and 1919 in spontaneous organization of a great body of producers and in their informal relation to the existing coöperative bodies. In Russian life an important part has long been played by the so-called cottage industries, which produce many of the articles most needed by the peasants. In 1915 there were 15,000,000 peasants engaged in cottage industries, mainly farmers filling in their winter time. During the early part of the Bolshevik régime the local bodies representing these cottage industries decided to create a central body, to study demand and to give information about requirements and market conditions. This permanent bureau called a congress in May, 1918, in Moscow. It invited the Kustars, or persons who make things at home, the cottage industrials; and the Kustar co-operatives, or those cottage industrials who are organized coöperatively. It also invited representatives of the municipal and social organizations which have business relations with the Kustars. The meeting agreed upon the need for an All-Russian Coöperative Council, which should have for its end the organization of cottage industries and of small industries into artels or unions. The difficulties growing out of political conditions were discussed. One of the greatest difficulties was the lack of certain raw materials. There had been some successful interference with the coöperatives getting what they

needed of those raw materials which are produced by large units, since that class of materials can be seized by the government. The raw materials that are local in their origin were in the control of the individual farmers and local bodies, and the government was less able to interfere. The movement in May led to a meeting in Moscow in August, 1918, and another and more formal one in February, 1919. Besides representatives of the Kustars the movement included:

(1) All the big central coöperative associations.

(2) The Mossow Narodny Bank.

(3) The All-Russian Union of Consumers Societies.

(4) Many local coöperatives and their artels.

This congress went ahead to introduce system into the cottage industries. It sought to take away the fortuitous nature of cottage production and distribution and to study the relation of any branch to the whole industrial situation in the nation or the region. It further discussed the political situation.

The call for the 1919 congress, giving the program, was signed by G. V. Petrov, at the request of the organizing committee, and I give a digest of parts of it to show the point of view:

"In the work of reconstruction, made necessary by the devastating events since 1914, the disaster

that has been met by big industry has increased many hundred per cent the importance of small industries as a producing factor. This importance may be temporary, but during the present conditions it cannot be much reduced. To bring about the required increase in the production of necessities it is requisite to have great help from small industry. Energetic and systematic activity is required of the small industries, not only because of our traditional motive of self-preservation and self-defense against the economic violence of big business, but also because the conditions of the time have put on small industries a task that is on a national scale. Now as formerly small industry has but one way out, and that is broad and deep cooperation of its forces and its means. The process of the coöperation of industries has always been a hard and long job, but at present it is economically easier. The idea of coöperative unions for buying, for selling, and for labor itself is now less in need of proving its essential usefulness. Of course the technical difficulties in the way of coöperation and unification of small industries are greater on account of a situation that has led us to the verge of starvation or at least to malnutrition and to the use of unacceptable substitutes for accustomed food. But this condition has led every one who formerly ignored coöperation to turn to it. This is because in the storm of the ruin of general economic life the small industries have preserved themselves more than any other force for future productive work. Working without stopping during the time when the big industries were dying the small industries inevitably took on the various character-

istics of coöperation. Even credit coöperation of all kinds is using the small producers more and more in its work. The state powers have not been able to get along without the small producers and they invite them into their organization on the basis of their labor communes or on the basis of their professional unions. In a word the whole trend in small industry is toward organization either on co-operative, communistic or some mixed basis. We have felt the necessity of getting clear in our minds and making an effort of the united will and mind of the small industries. The people who have taken part in coöperative organization want to define their bases and the tendency of the future work. The congress will have to express itself on the question of whether it still remains true that the organization of the cottage industrials on a coöperative basis is the most pressing and important aim of that industry. The congress will have to analyze the question of whether the industry has been changed in the process of introducing a socialistic organization, and if so how much. It must decide on the forms and methods of coöperative activity that will be the most likely to form a good national coöperative organism. Is coöperation to take the leadership in the general questions of credit, consumption, distribution? Are the coöperative associations going to do this? This is not an academic question. It has the most pressing importance. There are questions which have never been answered. What about the professional (Bolshevik) unions in small industries? What about the extent of their interference in these small industries? Here is a letter from one of our provincial units. It says: 'The lack of clear-

ness and the treachery of the ruling circles toward coöperation in general and toward artisan coöperation in particular; the perfectly arbitrary relation toward coöperation of local authorities, plus a whole mass of questions about the organization of the cottage industrial coöperation, will demand a general solution. All this speaks for the immediate calling of the representatives and partakers in industrial coöperation. Everything which we workers on the spot see and hear, every day and every hour, must be expressed, without color but without reserve. If we at the conference are able to find a common language with the governing power we will gladly work with it. If we do not hear from it what we want to hear we shall know that we can expect help from nowhere; and if we see that the condition of coöperation is hopeless we will get out. We cannot delay further."

The call then goes on to give a program in detail. This program included among others the problems of transportation, competition with commercial and industrial capitalism, private enterprises, individual cottage industry and coöperative cottage industry, the buying of raw material, the disposal of produce, how to obtain a supply of half-manufactured goods for completing processes, instruction among cottage artisans, publication, specialists, a polytechnical school, credit, finance, legal help, insurance, sanitation, wages, profit, responsibility toward other coöperatives, responsibilities toward outsiders, occupational diseases.

The question put with so much feeling here, of the life and death outlook for coöperation as it faces a powerful military state socialistic government, is still in the process of working out; and on the result depends much of the future of Russia, and not a little of the future of the world. Within a year the number of unions affiliated with the Kustarsbyt was increased from 14 to 100. The number of peasants constituting the membership is estimated at from 10,000 to 15,000. They supply practically the whole country with boots. Of household implements it is estimated that they produce 80 per cent. They make the coarser cloth. They are the tar-distillers. They are the carpenters and harness-makers. They also furnish some luxuries, as lace, silk, jewelry, and toys. An interesting article by A. E. Malakhov, formerly chairman of the Kustarsbyt, or Central Union of the Cottage Industrials, calling attention to the second anniversary of the federation in August, 1920, says:

"Before the war, Germany imported yearly into Russia up to 1,000 tons of aniline dyes. Only some 350 tons of these were known to reach the clients of the importers among the textile manufacturers, while the destination of the remaining 650 tons remained for a long time a mystery. In order to solve it, the German importers undertook a special investigation, which showed that the dyes are bought up by the Kustari. And it must be borne in mind

that while practically all the mills turn out dyed tissues, only a part of the Kustari followed this course.

"We Russians have been taught from infancy that our Kustar industries are a relic of the period of a primitive economy, and that they will vanish like a soap bubble before the approaching big industry. Practically the whole of the advanced public opinion of Russia accepted this teaching as the genuine truth. The class governing now in Russia—the proletariat, which itself is an infant of the big industry—has long ago proclaimed the watchword: 'Death to the Kustar trade; long live the big industries!' However, up till now the watchword has not been put into effect. Up till now one thing is clear, and must be put on record. Notwithstanding the sympathies of the Government, the big industry collapsed like a house of cards, while the contemptible Kustar trades, predestined to die a natural death, have taken upon their shoulders the task of providing the nation with all the necessaries of life.

"Now, even the enemies of Kustar industries have had to confess that the latter appeared as the only force during the Revolution capable if not to restore, at least to sustain the economic life of the country.

"Who knows, perhaps thanks to the Kustar trades alone, Russia will conquer in the end. The peasants shoulder the whole burden of the fight for a better social order, in supporting and supplying the population with food, dress, and fuel."

Mr. Malakhov, whose hostility to the Bolsheviks

caused him to leave Russia, gave in The Russian Coöperator, London, an account of the situation, of which the following are essential parts:

"In their fight against Coöperation, as representing middle-class interests, the Bolsheviki suffered a complete defeat, while the coöperative principles were fully endorsed by the population.

"Even in cases when the Soviet authorities displayed their arms against Coöperation and subjected it to violence, their acts did not and could not affect the substance of the movement. This was strikingly demonstrated in the nationalization of the Moscow Narodny Bank and the Centrosoyus.

"In the first case the shares of the M. N. B. remained with the coöperative organizations. The shares may be worthless, but in the proper books of the bank we shall find entries testifying that the bank owes a given sum to this or other coöperative organization, which sum coincides accurately with the value of the shares paid by that organization. The management of the bank is elected as before by Cooperation: the Discount Committee is composed as before of representatives of Coöperation.

"The same happened with the Centrosoyus. It is true that commissaries have been introduced and are exercising control. But Coöperation never evaded proper control. The management of the Centrosoyus is responsible to Coöperation; the initiative remains in the hands of Coöperation, just as the economic and administrative side of the business. The decree has succeeded only in labeling distributive stores with a new name—'communes.'

"All the other All-Russian organizations, as well as the local unions and individual coöperative so-

cieties, are free from nationalization, and even from control. The foundation of Coöperation is intact and not destroyed, because the local unions have not been destroyed, and all the Soviet decrees remain but scraps of paper. The attempts at nationalization, as far as they have been undertaken, did not touch or affect either the initiative or the self-management or the principles and ideas of Coöperation.

"Even more. Numbers of new coöperative societies and organizations have sprung up all over the country, mostly of the productive and agricultural type. Numbers of new unions and several new central organizations have come into existence.

"All insurance companies have been abolished. Coöperation, however, has created its insurance organization—the All-Russian Coöperative Insurance Union—and the latter is not only not persecuted by the authorities, but they are rather anxious to insure with this Union all the cattle in the country, and negotiations to that effect are being carried on.

"Not only do all the central coöperative organizations which were created before the Bolshevist era continue to live and to work, but under the Bolsheviki, a number of new coöperative centers have been called into life. The building of the coöperative edifice goes on as before. Economic organizations, such as the Central Association of Fruit Growers and Market Gardeners, the Potato Union, the Coöperative Grain, the 'Kustarsbyt,' and others, and several coördinating centers for Agricultural and Industrial Coöperation have been established.

"The economic changes wrought by the crisis, scarcity of goods, breakdown of transport, and the communistic policy, have introduced some new elements in the work of coöperation. At present, the

only economic force, the only live force which works and creates values and goods, is represented by the small farmer, the artisan and the kustar. And it is to them that coöperation has turned most of its attention and adapts its work and organization. It is through them that the population strives to improve its economic position, to set up anew its industries, proceeding on coöperative lines. And it can be said without exaggeration that the future of the country lies with the newly arisen and growing productive and agricultural coöperation.

"A certain change of front is also noticeable in distributive coöperation. Although its All-Russian center (the Centrosoyus) is now entrusted with the task of distributing commodities on a national scale, but very little is being done in the sphere of organizing the producer. When the crisis under which the country is laboring is caused, not by over-production, but by absence of goods, there is nothing to distribute. In addition, distributive coöperation has split into two, the labor coöperative societies having taken a line of their own, and having become a kind of State organization attached to the Supreme Economic Soviet.

"At present the Centrosoyus embraces only rural distributive societies and unions. But this fact has called forth a remarkable unity amongst all types of coöperation (excluding the labor coöperative organizations). The struggle which all forms of cooperation had to wage against the Bolshevist decrees and policy has also been responsible for this closing of ranks. There is no sign of antagonism between the productive and distributive branches of the movement, because the majority of consumers are

now the same producers, being organized in the respective organizations."

While the war-record of coöperation has been nowhere else so dramatic as in Russia, there have been plenty of striking developments. Before the war the governments of Germany and Austria had frowned on the growth of coöperation, which was not an unnatural thing for centralized despotisms to do. During the war they turned toward it for help. I question whether they can ever be unsympathetic toward it again, if the trend of the world is democratic.

Believing that coöperation is the soundest of the existing devices for purifying our system of economic life, I naturally take an intense interest in the small beginnings in America. Before the war almost nothing had been accomplished. This was not unnatural since the coöperative movement sprang out of needs which have been heretofore little felt in America. Coöperative stores were started from time to time, but to a large extent they failed. To make any coöperative enterprise succeed requires the same skillful management that private business requires. The poor people who usually start them have neither the training nor the time. To enter into competition with mail order houses, chain stores, and department stores, as well

as the ordinary small store, is no easy undertaking. Often there is direct hostility. I have sometimes found this among business men even in Denmark and England, particularly where there is a feeling that taxation laws favor the coöperatives. Here there is not that reason for criticism, but on the contrary everything has been against coöperative effort. Our banking habits have made it harder than in other countries to obtain credit. Charges have frequently been made that the hostility of competing tradesmen has been so effective as to induce wholesale establishments and railroads to refuse or unreasonably to delay supplies. The real obstacle, however, has certainly been in the state of mind of the people. This state of mind, this indifference, is now apparently changing. During 1918, 1919, and 1920 there has been keen interest. The causes of the eagerness seem to have been the high cost of living and the growing realization of the nature of the economic conflict. The second cause is expressed by Mr. Gustavson in the speech from which a quotation appears at the head of this chapter. It cannot be pretended that there is the solid foundation for expansion given by the laborious preparation in the European countries, but there is a vague and large American enterprise that may suddenly collapse, or on the other hand may accomplish something new. The effort to federalize the various

state coöperatives has been serious since 1918, with British experience as a model. The middle west and the far west contain the most active centres. Nineteen-twenty has been notable for an attempt to organize the farmers and the laborers into the same coöperative movement. The word coöperative has been used loosely in this new movement and no doubt most of the real work still remains to be done, but the mere fact that big labor unions and farmer unions are excitedly attempting coöperation means much. Rochdale may be the model for what finally happens, or we may find new American forms. There is room in our country for many modes of united economic effort by the people, and every one of them that is seriously carried out will be education toward a more coöperative, simple, and kindly life. It is not only in its actual accomplishments that the coöperative movement mitigates the régime of private capital, but notably also in the education it carries about what can be done by ordinary people. It destroys some ancient and hard-worked fallacies. For example, a favorite argument of stand-patters against higher wages and against profit-sharing is based on the part played by capital in modern life. One of this school will first demonstrate that the rich man of to-day does not put his earnings in a sock, eat them up, or give them to chorus girls. They go into extension of

business, thus causing more goods to be produced in the world, which is triumphantly pointed out to be a better thing for the laborer than it would be to have all the surplus wealth in the world divided, which would give the individual only a few dollars more. The argument leaves out two considerations. One is that labor also is capable of using its earnings as capital to be invested, and this point is demonstrated by the coöperative movement all over the world. The other point is that production to-day creates a large volume of things that the world would be just as well without, and fails to create many things bitterly needed, such as adequate houses. A world in which labor played a more determining part in production and distribution would not be likely to do worse. Kings used to argue that they could rule for the general welfare much better than a mob could. Barons and other favored individuals formed a class and clearly demonstrated that the world would deteriorate in prosperity, culture, and virtue if the power were taken away from them. The arguments against political democracy have been the same in the past that the arguments against industrial democracy are to-day; and many American business men discuss these matters with the easy superiority of a twelfth century noble.

Discontent with the degree of power exercised by

big business has been a spur to the recent American movement. Nebraska farmers undertook to start their own beet sugar factory. Coöperative slaughter-houses have been urged with much force as a needed answer to the packing situation. Plans for the coöperative furnishing of flour and meal have naturally been much to the front. As one-man flour mills have been in successful operation it is absurd that wheat should not be turned into flour and bread near where it is grown. The tendency to create monopoly of one necessity in Chicago, another in Minneapolis, another in New York, has been definitely fostered by the railroads, just as the building up of big cities at the expense of smaller places has been fostered. A reversal of the long and short haul policy would have been enough, all alone, to have saved us from much of the difficulty of living that we now face. It costs more to do business in a big city than in the country, and it costs more to live in the city. Obviously there is a saving in having factories located near the source of the needed raw material. Yet we send the raw material all across the country and the finished product all the way back again.

The following are extracts from a report made in 1918 by C. C. McChord, of the Interstate Commerce Commission:

"Low freight rates have been initiated and maintained for years from producing centers to important junction and jobbing cities and towns. To towns beyond higher rates, both actually and relatively, have been maintained. Through rates from factories or great producing territories to towns beyond the jobbing centers are made up of a combination of the rates to such centers and those beyond. The result is, in many instances, to deprive the country point of just rates. The following table gives comparisons of through rates on certain articles in carloads and less than carloads now in effect to Cincinnati, Ohio; Williamsburg, Ky.; Chicago, Ill.; Omaha, Nebr.; Kansas City, Mo.; Alliance, Nebr., and Dodge City, Kans., from New York, N. Y., together with distances, as illustrative and representative of thousands of similar rate situations throughout the country, and showing the handicap under which the country towns are compelled to do business:

	Carloads.	Less than carloads.
COTTON PIECE GOODS.	*Cents per 100 lbs.*	*Cents per 100 lbs.*
From New York, N. Y., to—		
Cincinnati, Ohio, 758 miles		72½
Williamsburg, Ky., 961 miles		125
Chicago, Ill., 908 miles		112½
Omaha, Nebr., 1,400 miles		138
Kansas City, Mo., 1,509 miles		138
Alliance, Nebr., 1,820 miles		255½
Dodge City, Kans., 1,701 miles		242
HATS AND CAPS.		
From New York, N. Y., to—		
Cincinnati		98
Williamsburg		174½
Chicago		112½
Omaha		201
Kansas City		201
Alliance		318½
Dodge City		308½

	Carloads.	Less than carloads.
BOOTS AND SHOES.	*Cents per 100 lbs.*	*Cents per 100 lbs.*
From New York, N. Y., to—		
Cincinnati		98
Williamsburg		174½
Chicago		112½
Omaha		201
Kansas City		201
Alliance		318½
Dodge City		308½
CLOTHING.		
From New York, N. Y., to—		
Cincinnati		98
Williamsburg		174½
Chicago		112½
Omaha		201
Kansas City		201
Alliance		318½
Dodge City		308½

	Carloads.	Less than carloads.
CROCKERY.	*Cents per 100 lbs.*	*Cents per 100 lbs.*
From New York, N. Y., to—		
Cincinnati	39½	52
Williamsburg	83½	104½
Chicago	45	60
Omaha	77½	110
Kansas City	77½	110
Alliance	131	193
Dodge City	129	192½
GLASSWARE.		
From New York, N. Y., to—		
Cincinnati	45½	72½
Williamsburg	104½	139
Chicago	52½	84
Omaha	91½	149½
Kansas City	91½	149½
Alliance	163	267½
Dodge City	159	247
SUGAR.		
From New York, N. Y., to—		
Cincinnati	39½	52
Williamsburg	86	98½
Chicago	45	60
SUGAR.—continued.		
From New York, N. Y., to—		
Omaha	61	100
Kansas City	61	100
Alliance	117½	171½
Dodge City	95½	167½
COFFEE.		
From New York, N. Y., to—		
Cincinnati	39½	52
Williamsburg	86	98½
Chicago	45	60
Omaha	61½	100
Kansas City	61½	100
Alliance	120	171½
Dodge City	106½	165
TEA.		
From New York, N. Y., to—		
Cincinnati	85½	98
Williamsburg	162	174½
Chicago	99	112½
Omaha	167	201
Kansas City	167	201
Alliance	267½	318½
Dodge City	264½	308½

"The following table gives the number of towns, as shown by the census of 1910, under 5,000 population in the States named, where industries might be located and where every opportunity would be afforded employees to make the most of life under ideal conditions:

	Under 1,000.	1,000 to 2,000.	2,000 to 3,000.	3,000 to 5,000.		Under 1,000.	1,000 to 2,000.	2,000 to 3,000.	3,000 to 5,000.
Illinois	3,800	179	79	43	Kansas	2,190	67	25	25
Michigan	3,480	105	20	24	Missouri	4,259	91	36	14
Wisconsin	2,480	70	21	25	Kentucky	5,290	52	14	10
Iowa	2,070	92	35	8	Virginia	5,160	41	13	12
Nebraska	1,510	53	17	21	West Virginia	3,800	44	18	9

"Thoughtful study should now be given to the equalization of rates for freight transportation, and

as to whether higher rates should for the future be permitted for shorter than for longer distances over the same line or route, the shorter being included within the longer distance, and whether combinations of rates and transit privileges that now unduly favor certain jobbing and junction points should be canceled and reasonable through rates established to all points. Transportation by boat on our rivers and coast lines should be encouraged, to relieve rail carriers at congested cities and ports. Steps have already been taken under Federal control to divert traffic from congested North Atlantic ports to those of the South and to the Gulf of Mexico. Rates should be made and facilities provided so that each port of the United States, from Galveston, Texas, to Bangor, Maine, shall receive its share of traffic under the most economical transportation conditions. Relatively the same facilities should be furnished the factory that ships one carload a day as the one that ships ten or more carloads. The opportunity to do a manufacturing business at a profit should be afforded at any point in the country. The supply of raw material and the possible field of consumption will dictate the location."

Concerning Mr. McChord's report, the following comments were made in the United States Senate:

Mr. Pittman: "The conditions that are causing the congestion now, and that have caused the congestion in the great cities of this country for years, are not decreasing but are steadily increas-

ing. Great factories are being built in certain sections because they cannot be built anywhere else and compete. As the factories grow men are drawn from all over the country to those factory towns, and as they are drawn there and labor becomes more plentiful at such points, again do the factories increase and the cumulative process ever continues.

"The result is inevitable. It means that a great country that is not only fit to live in but is the most wholesome place in the world in which to live is absolutely abandoned.

"Not only that, but the men who could be fed close to the farms must have their food transported clear across the country at the expense of the people and to the obstruction of the railroads that are the arteries of trade.

"We all know what is meant by the long and short haul. We all know what is meant by the back haul. We know that the railroad companies would ship freight from Chicago to San Francisco cheaper than they would ship to intermediate points. We know they would ship freight cheaper from Chicago to San Francisco or Sacramento than to Reno, Nevada.

Mr. King: "Or to Salt Lake City."

Mr. Pittman: "Or to Salt Lake City, or to Ogden, and just as cheap as they ship it to Denver. We all know that they would charge more to deliver freight from the town of Ogden to a point 25 miles out than they would charge to deliver it from San Francisco to the same point; that they would charge more to deliver freight from Reno to a place 25 miles out of Reno along the railroad than they

would from San Francisco to the same point, and yet San Francisco would be 300 miles away. Why? For the very purpose of giving San Francisco that field of trade and depriving the local States of the same trade. This means that Nevada wheat, wool, meats, hides, and other products must go to San Francisco for manufacture or reshipment. It means that no important manufacturing plant or wholesale establishment can exist in Nevada.

"I do not know whether the railroads are to blame in the matter or not. I have often doubted it. Take a center like San Francisco, where five or six great railroads concentrate, and if one railroad company says: 'We will do away with this discrimination,' then the chamber of commerce, representing the business interests of San Francisco, says to the other railroad companies, 'We will give you all our business.'

"I presume competition between the railroad companies in these great centers has compelled them to listen to the selfishness of business men of those communities. I am not condemning these men or bodies, but I am condemning the conditions that permitted such great wrong to be done a community and permanent injury to our whole country through the misuse of public utilities.

"When there was a hearing with regard to the increased rate to Pacific port points, and when the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco fought that raise, one of the attorneys for the railroad companies said, 'Yes; we have built up San Francisco by discrimination against interior points, and if you are going to oppose fair rates to San Francisco we will build up our interior country, which

is not in competition with water rates.' They have always had the power to build up the interior country. The interior country needed no assistance. All that was needed was to throw down the artificial barriers to trade and it would seek its proper point of operation. Under private ownership it never could be accomplished, because the law of competition, the law of self-aggrandizement, the ambition for personal profit of the railroad companies, always stood in the way of carrying out the higher idea in building up the roads of this country."

Whatever we may think of the technical aptness or futility of the devices sometimes suggested, the west has had a correct instinct of freedom in the jealousy and alarm it has shown over the progress of government by large corporations. In this sense the impulse behind the recent coöperative movement is political, but it is political only in the meaning in which we have seen small business and coöperation in Russia striving for their existence. Of the men who led in the deliberations of the Farmer-Labor conference at Chicago, in February of this year, one was the head of a farmers' union that did a business in 1919 of $85,000,000, and the other was the Grand Chief of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers; both were concerned with the problem of building up forces to offset those that have acquired more control than is consistent with a free national life. The meeting approved the general

Rochdale idea. It held that finance is the most important next step. As it was put by Mr. Stone, head of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, the railroad brotherhoods alone now have on deposit in private banks forty-two million dollars, "the interest of which is being used to fight the groups who deposited the money." Such words sink deep. Later steps, it is hoped, will mean the elimination of useless middlemen, unnecessary capital, needless advertising, commissions, and other superfluous expenses. One plan that was emphasized was for cooperatively owned daily newspapers. A number of such newspapers, ably conducted, might do much to modify our civilization. They would be able to discuss some fundamental needs with a freedom seldom indulged in by the journals of private profit.

Of what has been accomplished so far in factories and knitting mills by the section hands, through their Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Men, this account was given:

"Our 387,000 members are section hands, trackmen, bridge workers. Their work is chiefly out of doors. They need clothes. We have cut their clothing cost 40 per cent by manufacturing and through buying from big manufacturers who give us 40 per cent discount rather than see us go into the same business. We have mills in Ypsilanti, Kalamazoo and Toledo, making gloves, socks, sweaters, underwear. A shirt factory will be opened soon in Wil-

liamston, Mich. Our gloves are of the cheapest cotton or the best Australian wool, running from 17 cents to $5.00 in price. One mill turns out 200 union suits a day. A surplus of 100,000 dozen mittens is to be turned over to farmers' coöperatives. A branch supply store is to be opened in Chicago for our 40,000 members there to buy clothes in. We can pay duty and transportation on our goods into Canada and then undersell the retailers. Yarn is one of our troubles. We are buying yarn from profiteers. What we want next is to connect with organizations of farmers who raise wool and will sell direct to us. Our mills are run the same as a capitalist would run them, only they are organized. With 100,000 of our members earning less than $3.00 a day and many thousands of them earning only $2.24 a day, we are interested in cutting the price of hosiery from 75 cents a pair to 25 cents as we have done. We are interested in going to overall manufacturers and buying large lots at 40 per cent discount. Our 387,000 members are 85 per cent American born or naturalized citizens. Yet I have been in many a home where the mother and children didn't have shoes on their feet."

The North Dakota experiment in coöperation, ending in State control, has had obviously the effect to be expected. The scare articles in our conservative newspapers, explaining how the control of the state by the Non-Partisan League has taken from the people of that state (I quote from an article in the New York Times) "their money, their newspapers, their banks, their constitution, and the con-

trol of their schools," have not stopped the spread of the example. Naturally you cannot put these things in the control of one element in society without taking it out of the control of another element. Nobody, as far as I know, denies that the farmers of North Dakota proceeded by constitutional methods to get possession of the state, and few persons who are detached and informed deny that they have run the state with such success in some important ways that their work can never be replaced by the old system. There will be modifications, of course, but something has happened that will not be forgotten. Simple farmers have shown that matters that are to them of great moment, such as the control of grain elevators—a necessity of their lives—with the accompanying control of the disposal of their crops, can be handled by them much more satisfactorily (to them) than they were handled by their betters. If the steps they have taken to protect themselves from the power of the beef trust are followed up and prove ultimately successful, as seems likely, one of the predominant evils of our time will have been solved not by the central government but by the people in one locality undertaking to do their own business, and blazing the trail for people in other localities.

The big political question in the American cooperative movement is whether farmers and labor

organizations will be able to work together. Both are in a wholesome, experimenting frame of mind, little influenced by extreme philosophy. Robert Bruère reports that in three full days of discussion at Chicago the word socialism was not heard once, and there was as little confidence in government action as there was in Marxian generalizations. What they meant to do was to take the next step themselves, and then the next, and then the next.

CHAPTER IX

THE ANSWER OF LIBERALISM

"The best protection for the present system is to improve it."

David Lloyd George.

"Men are never so likely to settle a question rightly as when they discuss it freely."

Macaulay.

"He that will not apply new remedies must expect new evils; for time is the greatest innovator. And if time, of course, alters things to the worse, and wisdom and council shall not alter them to the better, what shall be the end?"

Bacon.

HAS liberalism an answer to socialism and to the evils connected with modern capitalism? In possibility it has the best of all answers. The doubt is whether it has the sincerity to make its answer effective. If it has the sincerity it will develop the brains.

Liberalism is a spirit that changes its form according to the civilization to which it is applied. It is the spirit that recognizes growth as inseparable from life but recognizes also that if change is to be

growth it must be based carefully on our experience. What most often stops an avowed liberal from being a real liberal is some sort of self-seeking fear. One thing that anybody must do in order to be truly liberal is to welcome all possible light from fact and thought, and then to make decisions about the world's good without impediment from calculations about his own immediate, worldly prosperity. Some of the British Tories have much to say for themselves in claiming that they are capable of more courageous disinterestedness, once the case is proved, than is a large commercial element in the Liberal party.

I have said enough about the answer of liberalism to the problem of international relations. As it confronts an American at the present time, it comes down to tolerance, close relations, and mutual responsibility between the nations, without the desire to exploit or to force one conception of civilization. The acid test of to-day is Russia, and the acid test of to-morrow threatens to be Mexico.

On the other great question, or group of questions, the relations between capital, labor, and the community, I want to be somewhat more specific than I have been on a number of points. I would restate the test of liberalism in another form: it must accept the possibility and the moral necessity of abolishing altogether the proletariat. It must

thus cut the ground from under socialism, by removing poverty and fear, without seeking the remedy in a large, dull, and oppressive central bureaucracy. The stability of business and society to-day is threatened by the proletariat. The only remedy is to abolish the proletariat. The proletariat is the mass with no stake in the community. Having no stake, it cares little about upsets. As it has neither experience nor stake, changes made by it in the structure of society would be rough and ignorant.

One of the most important immediate steps toward abolishing the proletariat could readily be taken if we had the will; from the point of view of present discontent it may be the most important of all. If our standards were higher, continuity of employment could easily be brought about. You do not find large numbers of salaried men anxious to upset existing civilization. That is because they are employed by the year. Labor should feel as secure in the regularity of its employment as the majority of salaried men do. This change would give to the laboring man a stake in the community, but it would do other things. It would also tremendously increase production. If a man works 200 days in a year now, how much more would he produce if he worked 300 days? It would be more than a 50 per cent gain, because the man's whole morals would be improved. Nothing deteriorates

a man more than insecurity and sporadic idleness. Moreover, if it is recognized that a man *must work*, the mind of the community will be busy inventing ways in which he can work productively, and that inventiveness would increase production in all sorts of incalculable ways. This regularity of employment and production is being sought now in some progressive factories, but the obligation is immediately in the big key industries.

The world has been accustomed to a sequence which may come again any time unless we have a program to avoid it; a lessening demand for steel, a lessening demand for ore, for pig iron, a shutting down of factories and mines. Such a sequence should not be allowed. The production of steel to be required in the future is not less than in the past. We should build our plans on averages, not on caprice and chance.

What in the world is more stable than pig-iron? That we are to need it is absolutely certain. The only substance comparing with it in stability is gold, and we may question whether in the immediate future its value will not be more stable than that of gold. Nothing is so easily stored. It is in all ways an ideal article on which to stabilize production. The only need is money to pay for the labor of producing it; and the government, or anybody else, would be entirely safe in lending money, even

up to billions, on the security of the pig-iron itself.

It would not, however, be necessary to store all the pig-iron beyond immediate requirements, because a large part of the articles into which pig-iron goes are entirely independent of style and occasion. They could be stored almost as well as the iron itself. We have a railroad system of 250,000 miles. For at least a generation we shall have use for all the steel rails that we can reasonably make, and these rails are not only indestructible but of secure value. There has, moreover, been no appreciable change in the form of a freight-car wheel in a generation, so that any quantity of these could safely be made. The same stability lies in certain kinds of cars. Similar tracing of the principle could easily be made from every basic metal, as copper, zinc, lead, aluminum. The present situation is that we have practically no reserves. It is a mere question of money to make the investment—of banking. The per piece cost is lowered, obviously, if you can give employees and plants occupation every working day in the year.

The panics of the last fifty years have all been connected with the production of pig-iron. The coal-mines follow, and the coke ovens; the railroads, not carrying ore, pig-iron and coke, lessen the demand for cars and engines. To stop this deadly sequence the only requirements are: (1) recogni-

tion that it *must* be stopped, (2) comprehensive thought, and (3) the ability to borrow a certain number of billions, partly as an investment, partly as working capital. It is clear enough, I fancy, that the task is one properly for the national government to begin and it should have been introduced as a new gain, had the election of 1918, under our obsolete system, not hopelessly divided our government. Had we made this trial with the great advantage of a government experiment it should have been led by a Director General, a one-man top, with an advisory committee. Such a plan should be marked out in detail and set going by Congressional committees or by separate departmental activities, but as things did come out in 1918 we lost the great opportunity and I am under no illusions about the chances and fully realize the probability of our drifting indefinitely and doing nothing.

The size of the job cannot be denied but the time is coming when the government will have to take to itself a very big although limited share in the stabilizing of life. If the government shall at any time hereafter take the lead in stabilizing employment there will have to be an immense number of departments. It is a vast effort in engineering. Many parts of the machinery were erected during the war. It was a question of transferring their use over into peace, or letting them be lost.

For the first time in American history we had a general survey of what we need and what we possess. If these boards had been used for definite tasks we could have succeeded; the tasks could have been thought out definitely. The law of statistics is now going through what the law of accounting went through. Thirty years ago accounting was an archæological inquiry. Now it is contemporary and practically a forecast of to-morrow. The government, if it ever takes this lead, must have the same spirit in statistics. For instance: How many plants in North Carolina will be idle at a particular period? How much copper can be used? How much cement? Where? How many men? What kind of men? What teams? The nearest approach we have now to such a system is in the reports of coal production. There should have been work in plenty, detailed and patient work, after the war for the Bureau of Statistics, the War Trade Board, the War Labor Board, the War Industries Board, the Federal Trade Commission, the Geological Survey, the Road-making Bureau, and many other existing bodies, all capable of feeding centralized reconstruction plans.

The government did not lead, however, and I do not see how after the election of November, 1918, it could have done so. If, as seems almost certain, we are to lose the value of all the experience we

had in the war, in stabilizing employment and production, this pessimism need not be applied to every governmental experience: for example, insurance. Nothing makes a man more properly conservative than insurance for himself and his family. From the time the war began up to Feb. 1, 1920, almost 4½ million Americans were insured, for an average of slightly over $9,000, and this almost 40 billion dollars of insurance was voluntary, contributive, not compulsory and not free. In 1916 all the old-line or legal reserve companies, all the fraternals, all the industrials, and all the assessment companies, combined, wrote less than $5,230,000,000. The expense of doing business for the War Risk Insurance Bureau fell below 5 per cent. the first year and still lower thereafter. Moreover, only one-third of this expense, or less than 2 per cent., is chargeable to insurance, the rest going to allowance, allotment and other departments. For a private company 15 per cent. is considered economical. How much would this government step alone, if it had been possible to make it permanent, and to extend it to other government employees, have done to keep the masses interested in stability? The government could have easily extended this system at once from soldiers and sailors to the whole realm of government employees. When everybody becomes a creditor of the government, you have an end of

your subversive mobs. If the government leads, the states, cities, big concerns, small concerns, follow. In this matter of insurance the government has done as much as it could do; since demobilization at the end of February, 1920, about 1/5 of the soldiers, or 900,000, have kept their insurance. In February, 1920, the amount was $7,500,000,000, or 18½% of the net total.

I am not afraid of being scolded for expecting much of government leadership sometime. In Rosario, the second largest city of Argentina, the industry of supplying drains is still conducted by a private company for profit, and no doubt the stand-patters of that Republic would view with alarm any suggestion that it be socialized. The furnishing of water by cities in our country was alarming a short time ago. Lighting the streets and distributing letters by public enterprise has been respectable longer. I am accustomed to paying toll when I cross a certain bridge between New Hampshire and Vermont, but on many other rivers private enterprise is safely superseded. How many turn-pike roads are left? Are schools, run by the community, deadly to private initiative? Are free libraries, concerts, lectures, museums? I do not care enormously just when it happens, but I find it difficult to believe that adding transportation and mines to the list will involve civilization in darkness. Only

when the government is in control of some of the great key industries can it lead in such ideas as I am sketching in this chapter. On whether capital takes the lead in the meantime will depend the speed and strength of the demand for government ownership. Mr. Hoover is surely right in saying that in this field of industry it is private capital's last chance.

Does any serious person doubt the importance of these things? Is it not clear that nobody who has a secure feeling about himself and his family, and a sense of the value of life, is likely to become a reckless agitator. Once we were content to treat yellow fever as a natural scourge of God, but after a while we went after the mosquito. So with typhoid, Black Death, infant mortality and famine. For men to average more than one-third of their days in involuntary idleness, as they do in some trades, is one of the scourges. In our *best* periods, we have about one and one-half million unemployed, due entirely to our evil system of distribution. The result of so scandalous a condition is to demoralize the community both in morale and efficiency. The man of uncertain life deteriorates. He becomes hostile and dangerous. Moreover, if democracy is to succeed, production must increase. We can level up only through increased production. We are not producing intelligently when men are idle over one

hundred days in a year and it is ostrich-like to charge our lack of adequate production to the faults of labor only. If progress in steadiness of employment, steadiness of production, and in insurance had been gained by the war, we should have gained much. If we could spend twenty-four billion on current expenses in one year of war, we could have spent say six billion as a capital investment to get started after the war. What we did not have to spend were the will and the brains. I like to believe that if the election of November, 1918, had gone differently, Mr. Wilson and Mr. McAdoo might have tried the great experiment.

Another step, and one that has a critical bearing on the moral condition of labor, will grow steadily among enlightened private employers. It is to give to the workers a share in the management. The Whitley Councils in England have government participation and initiative, and we are feeling our way in that direction. In brief the Whitley system gives to workmen a share in the management, and arranges for grievances to be handled as soon as they arise, instead of waiting until they become acute. In this country the I. W. W. is strong where capitalism is savage. Bitterness in labor diminishes where generosity and kindness are found in capital. The way to deal with criticism is to make it share in the responsibility. A clever political chairman,

if faced by a proposal offering many difficulties, puts the proposer at the head of a committee to work out and submit a solution.

The employer who has the best chance to go through the complicated times on which we must enter is he who shares the problem with his employees. If they are on salaries, not wages; if they are in charge of those factory problems that most immediately affect them; if they sit on committees which look at the financial difficulties as a whole; and if the advantage resulting to them from success is in fair proportion to the advantage resulting to capital: in such a case the barbarous hostility between the two forces in production does not flourish. I have had various friends and acquaintances engaged in passing along a share of power to employees, and I have never known one to be disappointed in the results. Many a man has told me stories of the ingratitude and unreason of employees, but he has ever been the man who was trying to see how little he could grant, not how much. There is no peace for the employer who looks upon justice as a concession, a gift to his protégés. Lord Bountiful has no salvation for us now. What we seek is not a master who behaves well as master; we seek a man who looks upon his power as a trust, to which is attached the responsibility for doing his bit

toward the skilful introduction of industrial democracy.

The steady, careful but rapid progress toward copartnership between capital and labor cannot be made by men who think they have been made by heaven the exclusive depositories of wisdom. There is a certain manufacturer of automobiles in this country who has deserved extremely well of the world. He has made farm life more satisfactory. He has potentially lowered the cost of distribution. He has known how to standardize successfully, to keep essentials, to reject all else, and not to be diverted from his original great idea. Also he has proved that high wages can be made the most profitable system for the manufacturer. Yet there is a limit to the sociological success achieved by this man. He has not created a condition as satisfying and as full of social promise as a few other employers. Why not? It is because he has too individualistic a conception of responsibility. He has too naïve an idea of his own competence to decide moral questions. His managers keep close track of how the money of the employees is spent, and on the record is based the decision as to whether extra payments shall be made to any employee. Imagine one grown-up man thinking he can decide for another grown-up man (for thousands of grown-up men) just what amount it is right that he should

spend on moving pictures. It is a far step ahead of fifteen years ago, when employers used to tell me that higher wages and shorter hours would merely be spent in drink, and that employers' liability acts would result in employees having their legs cut off on purpose; a far step ahead, but yet the same refusal to see the employee as a fellow-man, mature like the employer, with virtues like him, with his own responsibilities for the conduct of his own existence.

The principle is general, but the actual work must be concrete, patient and detailed. Admitting the moral, political and economic law, we have to go ahead and give our lives to its fulfilment. That is where the business men come in. In the past those business men won glory who hurried the inevitable course of material development across the western plains. In the immediate future those who do most for the world will be those also who do most for the stability and permanent success of their own concerns, by removing disruptive tendencies, and by creating enthusiastic team-play. There is no class in the country that is, on the whole, more reasonable than labor. There are exceptions, not only in desperate groups, like part of the I. W. W., but in some of the skilled trades also, where frequent unfair demands and needless strikes keep the situation upset, but the wider one's experience with

labor the more he will say, if he is open to ideas, that the mass of labor surprises by its broad-mindedness rather than by impatience or narrowness.

Obviously labor cannot in the long run expect to get the same results for itself when production is slow as when it is ample, but why should we expect labor to take a broader view until it has won the affirmative rights and benefits of partnership? Moreover, it believes (what is true) that irregularity of employment and of production is the result of stupidity and would not occur if we had the economic system we ought to have. If there were a real partnership the intense interest of labor in regularity of employment would result in constant serious attention being given to this problem, the base of all others.

To increase the efficiency of labor is a matter of infinite study and good will. As examples a few of the steps that we should all be studying may be roughly indicated thus:

(a) Stop the labor turn-over. It gives a double loss. There is a loss in transit and a heavy loss in efficiency. Labor cannot be kept stationary by force, except in crises, but it should be kept stationary by uniformity of employment, by pecuniary interest in the business, by pleasant conditions of living.

(b) Is really a corollary to (a), but deserves sep-

arate emphasis. Seasonal work must be as far as possible abolished. In the principal industries it can readily be done. In the others it must be supplemented by work to be done in the same neighborhood at other seasons; some of which must be organized intentionally by the city, state or government, or by great coöperative institutions.

(c) Scientific management must be used intensively, and the opposition to it of both labor and capital must be overcome. Frederick W. Taylor, the father of efficiency study, who died a few years ago, calculated that a first-class workman can under proper conditions, without cost to health or strength, produce from two to four times what he actually does produce. Taylor lacked certain human conceptions, but his genius focussed an idea that will play a great part in constructing a new world.

Since in politics we have learned, or had learned before this war, that responsibility makes for conservatism, why are we so reluctant to test the same principle in industry? When kings and barons had to admit the masses to political decisions the masses did not become dangerously radical. The only dangerous radicalism on a large scale is violent reaction from a war brought on, cheered on, pressed to its furthest limit by the too powerful few, and followed by a peace controlled by the same elements. There is no principle safer than this one:

that a reasonable share in power and responsibility makes for rational conservatism; that too large a concentration of power makes for blindness in those who wield it. The principle is as true in industry as in earlier branches of politics. If the principle is conceded, why not have the courage to follow it, not merely academically, in discussing what has been, but, like statesmen, in navigating the safest course toward what is to be? How many of us are at heart like a certain old gentleman, whose character was thus described to me by one who knew him better than I did: "He was truly a remarkable man. Respectability, with its accompanying conspiracy to ignore what is unpleasant, dominated his entire life. Beneath appearances, beneath conventionality and all the illusions upon which it rested, and destined in the final conflict to triumph over them all, lay his unconquerable clannishness, the sole sense of reality with any hope of surviving him. But even this was not his truest and deepest self. Underneath clannishness, social conventions, respectability, everything, and inaccessible to all appeals, was the sense of power, due solely to wealth, a power which his indomitable will held fast to the end."

I believe the best hope for ushering in industrial democracy with skill lies in increasing realization by American business men of the problem of a

new distribution of power. The foremost rôle can scarcely be taken by anybody except our business men. The slogan of the experts since the war has been, "The volume of production is everything." The reply of labor, expressed with less forensic training and deprived of any powerful press, is that the volume of production is not everything; that production to-day runs largely to useless and even harmful luxuries, expensively advertised; that both production and distribution are carried on irregularly, wastefully; that new ideals of life and new distributions of power are worth suffering for. To bring about smoothly constructive changes in production, distribution, and power, is the problem of all problems. We are in for the great adventure; the only issue is whether we are to be led by knowledge or by stumbling inexperience.

What are the business questions about which men in the highest positions of power, whether political or business, should be specially equipped? They include the relations between different countries. Huge economic relations between different countries must be worked out. At home we must find answers to such evils as involuntary unemployment, insecurity of employment, insecurity of old age, production of the needed things, idleness of plants as well as of men, crushing of individual effort and

variety by big units, use of railway rates to favor growth of trusts and of big cities, inefficiency of overgrowth, prevention of labor from sharing the knowledge and the responsibility of the business in which it is employed.

Some of my radical friends distrust the enlightened but cautious business man, in whom I put a special hope. The powerful engineering mind was in its element in the recent struggle. It will not be less in its element in the longer after-struggle, wherever it is found in a man who can welcome the broad sharing of power, which is often the most difficult thing for a very efficient man to do. I can easily realize why not every thinker who reflects as rebelliously as I do on our present society has the same respect for organizing force that I have. A radical friend of mine often tells the story of a man who walked down Fifth Avenue with the devil. This man, at one point, reached up and took a piece of truth out of the air. The devil paid no attention. "Does it not worry you," the man asked, "to have me get hold of a piece of pure truth?" "Not a bit," the devil said, "for as soon as a man finds a piece of truth he organizes it, and then it is truth no more."

I could match this with a favorite story of my own from the Chinese. A man, by speaking certain magic words, made a stick draw the water from his

well, which formerly he had drawn by hand. Later he found that by breaking the stick into parts, and speaking the words over both parts, he could make each part do as much as the whole stick had done. Before the end of his experiments he had a multitude of pieces working for him, drawing the water for all the village. It happened, however, that the man at one point forgot the words by which the sticks were controlled. He no longer was able to tell them to stop. The whole village was flooded and all the inhabitants were drowned. The Chinese tell it as a parable of modern industry.

Although I have much sympathy with this fear of our age of machinery, nevertheless I said to my friend: "Your story is against yourself, because organization is a good, though it is abused. Because of steam, large scale production, public education, increasing population, there is more happiness, more light in the masses than there ever was before. Thirty million people might live in Germany if she had the organization of 1840. To support 70,000,000 with higher material comfort, organization is a necessity."

Then I told him about Thomas Hardy's dog. He was a young sheep dog, notably logical for a dog. Usually he worked under the control of an older and more conservative canine, but once he found himself all alone with the sheep before him. He

had formulated the premise that chasing sheep was a good thing. He chased them. He chased them until they fell over a precipice and were all killed. The same day the young dog was shot. "Another instance," says Hardy, "of the untoward fate which often attends dogs and other philosophers who follow out a train of reasoning to its logical conclusion, and attempt a perfectly consistent conduct in a world made up so largely of compromise."

Modern organizing ability and large-scale productiveness are essential facts in any world-outlook to-day. It is true, however, that they are not the qualities in which we have been falling short. They are essential but they are not enough, as the past six years abundantly show. Executive and administrative ability is not frequently combined with cunning and inhumanity. Happily it is frequently combined with generosity, power of growth, and many-sidedness. The future largely depends on such men. If they side with reaction, the industrial revolution will come nevertheless, but violent and destructive. If they take the lead in sanity, seeking a great construction, we may gain smoothly a world in which not only the average but also the favored people are happier than before.

To our business men we might put the situation in some such way as this:—no period is truly great unless it has great ideals, a spirit of its own high

enterprise. A time is never made interesting by timidity and unbelief. Greatness to-day and to-morrow must lie in creating a world where constantly increasing production is made possible by constantly increasing harmony. As a basis for this harmonious energy there must be in every unit, in every factory, its share of responsibility and of hope. No country in the world equals the United States in natural advantages for taking the lead in such a re-creation. What percentage of our business men have the heart and the imagination to meet the need of our day? How much is there in them of creative faculty, of true originality? Strong natures respond to big needs. We are at the entrance to one of the worst periods of modern history, or one of the best. A few thousand business men in America can determine which path our country is to take.

In perfect honesty to ourselves I think it is necessary to say that another great class, the lawyers, are less promising than the business men. Many of the best thinkers are lawyers, but on the whole the bench is reactionary. The realization of this has long been vivid in leaders like Col. Roosevelt and Mr. Bryan, but they have not found the remedy. What I believe to be the basic attitude of the leader of liberalism to-day, Mr. Wilson, is illustrated in the famous Brandeis case, and I think a clear statement

of that case will put the matter more effectively than much generalization.

The Supreme Court stands like a stone wall in defense of those conceptions of property that are essentially retentive in their nature, and it interprets those conceptions with all the strictness of fear. The appointment of Mr. Brandeis was followed by the appointment of another liberal judge, but we have no guarantee of the next step. I am not among those who believe that if there were another vacancy during Mr. Wilson's term he might appoint somebody of the turn of mind of Mr. Palmer, for example. He appointed Justice McReynolds, to be sure, but his mind has focussed much more sharply on the problem since then. What is much more probable is that succeeding reactionary Presidents will prevent the court from becoming a true expression of our times. Mr. Brandeis has often said that the trouble lay not in the constitution of the United States, but in its interpretation. The men who drew that instrument were great men, but they could not count on being succeeded by an era, in times to come, when we were to hang to the letter and thus lose the spirit. The men who made the constitution thought for themselves. Many of our rulers to-day expect their ancestors not only to do their general thinking for them, but also to make the specific application.

That the President sees all these truths as vividly as anybody is, I think, without any doubt. When he asked one of his advisers his opinion of the wisdom of putting Mr. Brandeis on the court his adviser was startled. "He is the greatest lawyer in the United States," was the reply, "and it will be a splendid appointment, but I hope you realize what a storm will be created when it is announced." The President smiled, "Let us see," he said, "I go west on Friday. I will send in the appointment on Thursday."

A storm it certainly did create. The Senate wrangled over the question of confirmation for months. It viewed with alarm. It had a special committee run down all the cock-and-bull stories that could be found. It was supported ardently by that prominent element in the bar that is parasitic to big business. It was ardently supported by Fifth Avenue, Wall Street, Newport, and State Street. We can blush with shame, we can despond, or we can smile with irony, according to our make-up, when we remember that among the leaders in this violent defense of the Supreme Court as a citadel of privilege were a large percentage of the men who are supposed to stand at the very top of our bar: also a large percentage of the Republican Senators who more specifically represent entrenched privilege. The Democratic Senators who represent en-

trenched privilege would have been just as strong in opposition, had it not been for Mr. Wilson's whip. Indeed, without that whip, cracked over a then frightened majority, the Senate would never have permitted such a threat to the serenity of existing wrongs.

The issue represented by this appointment was illustrated in the remark made to me a number of years ago by a man who was then a brilliant and successful young reformer. I had spoken of how useful Mr. Brandeis could be in such a position as Secretary of Commerce, but my friend replied: "No, those administrative positions do not amount to anything. The place for such a man is on the Supreme Court of the United States. That is where progress is permitted or blocked." When the possibility actually did come in sight, that Mr. Brandeis might be put on the court, I talked over the idea with the most distinguished woman reformer in the country. Again the question came up of the relative importance of different positions. "The court is the place where a man of that quality can do the most," she said. "Think what it would mean to everybody who is actually working at the underlying problems anywhere. Modern steps are constantly stopped by the Supreme Court of the United States. In the individual states the state courts upset the work of the state legislatures and these state

courts are controlled in their turn by the nine men in Washington. Every social worker in the land would draw a breath of hope if Mr. Brandeis were to go on the Supreme Court, and there would be no spot in the country that would not be affected."

Let us sum up, then, what for young Americans of to-day are tests of whether a mind belongs in the advanced liberal group, as opposed both to the standpatters and the doctrinaire socialists:

(1) The complete abolition of private capital is a mere doctrine, questionable even as ideal, and harmful if an immediate purpose. Remote evolution will be taken care of by our descendants.

(2) The duties to be imposed on the central government must be carefully studied. To impose some duties is as mistaken as not to impose others, but it might do much for leadership and for stability.

(3) The conception that production is to be carried on in such ways as to produce the largest dividends on the so-called "investment" is wasteful and cruel. The most important part of the investment is the lives of the laborers. If an enterprise pays 20% and the men are involuntarily idle 100 days in the year, the enterprise is actually run at a heavy loss to the community. Regularity of employment is a necessity and a right.

(4) The abuses of the present industrial system are such as will not be endured by labor much

longer. Standpat victories against this principle are temporary, and mean trouble soon.

(5) That labor should not be represented in management at least equally with capital is an anachronism.

(6) The degree of control exercised by capital will vary according to the nature of the business. Likewise will vary the degree of control exercised by labor and the degree exercised by the state. The purpose should be to allow as much control by the labor engaged as is possible; enough return to capital to offer a fair inducement to saving; and only such control by the national government as the consumer's interests require.

(7) We must seek healthy modes of growth away from the present excessive private capitalism by various kinds of coöperation, notably the co-operative movement proper, which is showing more vitality than any other offset to private capitalism. The relation of these movements to national control must be worked out by ardent brains and by experience.

(8) The most important of all things in a democracy is education. Among the ruling powers business stands first. In America to-day it contains much reaction, but also the seeds of rapid and useful growth. The most reactionary great force in the

country is the lawyers. The most rapid single practicable step forward would be to appoint to the Supreme Court three men who understand the nature of liberty and the facts of modern life.

CHAPTER X

FROM WILSON TO THE FUTURE

"I learned a great deal about Mexico by listening to a sufficiently large number of lies."

Woodrow Wilson.

"For ten years Wilson had taught revolution, revolution after peaceful methods. Constitutions, laws, and social habits which everywhere upheld the unprecedented inequalities in modern society created by the industrial revolution of the last century he would amend, repeal, or ameliorate. Even governments he had attacked on his tours through England and Italy. It was a day of the self-determination of peoples and a new-old struggle for democracy. As a result of this constant preaching he had been elevated to the governorship of a state, then to the presidency of the United States, and now he stood in Paris, confronted by the ancient enemy of all revolution, of democracy. His own country was officially against him; its articulate elements had grown tired of his reforms, greater reforms than any other leader of the United States had ever effected, and had learned how to thwart him."

Professor William E. Dodd,
Chicago University.

Washington's responsibility is greater than any other's, for through its hidebound conservatism, its

incredible timidity and its loathsome partisanship, all the perils unforeseen at the time of the armistice have been made possible. If the United States Senate could have been persuaded to forego its small-souled opposition to the League of Nations, that organization would have been powerfully in existence long ago. It was intended to restrain the arrogant and the vengeful; it was designed to restore and guarantee peace; it was specially charged with just and benevolent revisions of the treaty; and all these things, with the United States as a member, it would have done.

"The treaty has failed and the League has failed because we have shirked our duty, and we have shirked our duty because Henry Cabot Lodge has found in the bedevilment of the covenant an opportunity to gratify the meanest and most misused personal animosity that ever figured in great affairs. If he and his followers would see what they have done by delaying peace and reconstruction, let them look at Europe, seething with revolution, suffering from hunger and disease, bankrupt, idle and threatened on one side by anarchy and on the other by resurrected or pinchbeck dynasties."

The New York World.

NO look ahead at the spirit of our time can leave out of account the seeds that Woodrow Wilson has sown. That his gigantic addition to the store of liberal intention and confidence in the world was diminished in 1918, 1919, and 1920 by qualities in him, and still more by qualities in his countrymen, is a tragedy that I have

no wish to gloss over. Such an amazing statement as that of Mr. Keynes, that the President's mind is slow, can be passed by with a shrug by those familiar with the brilliant speed of Mr. Wilson's apprehension. Also we can safely dismiss all the current jargon about his being academic, and being satisfied to enunciate a principle, careless of its working out. How can anybody emit that judgment with the history of the Federal Reserve system, probably the most constructive piece of legislation since the Civil War, fresh in our minds? How could any one say it who remembered the concentrated work Mr. Wilson did on the tariff? Back in the Princeton days was he satisfied to preach democracy, or did he split the college wide open by applying it? No, the personal reason of importance that is connected with the débâcle is the quality that makes the President dislike to coöperate in close personal touch with men of opposite will.

The best in Wilson and Wilsonism is not dead. This best is for us to cherish. The money trust can never flourish as it did before 1912. The tariff can never again be made in the secret offices of privilege. But other gifts are not safe without the continuing vigilance that spells liberty, the vigilance that it behooves liberalism especially to furnish. Who can assure us that we are not to be plunged into a mean and reactionary war with Mexico?

The propaganda has been long in preparation. Part of this propaganda is studied, part is instinctive. At the time of the Villa raid, it is not an exaggeration to say, exactly one man stood between us and invasion, and that service of Wilson's in a time of popular brain-storm is never to be forgotten.

During the campaign of 1916, I wrote the following prediction:

"If some dramatic accident, with Germany or Mexico, does not come along to distract attention, the voter who has not yet made up his mind will be swayed in the end, when he has reflected carefully, by a few simple considerations.

"The country is prosperous.

"We avoided war with Germany and yet won an epoch-making victory for international law; epoch-making, that is, if Germany does not return to her earlier policy. If she does, it will mean war, and the issues will change.

"We have thus far been able to avoid interfering with Mexico's attempt to realize herself. It has been a delicate and difficult maneuver, but up to now it has been accomplished. The voter will ask himself whether he would have preferred a policy based on American investments. Here again, if war comes, the issues will change."

We did go into the war and the issues did change. The Mexican situation and its menace still confront us. It is not improbable that we may find our policy committed to finding excuses for an invasion

of Mexico and a domination of that country's finances and resources. In my 1916 article I summed up:

"Beyond these conditions lies one inclusive question. In which of the two great divisions of human thought do you belong? Are you Liberal or Tory? If you dread the struggle to put ideals into public life, if you deem established privilege the safest foundation, you should next November vote Republican."

Writing the chapter called "Without a Party" I have already indicated that I do not believe that either of the big parties can be called liberal in itself. During the time of Wilson's influence, however, I have tended to think the Democratic reactionary elements less subtle and dangerous than the Republican reactionary elements. The South is worried by a race-problem, and we often think of that situation as inevitably meaning reaction; and yet the South followed not only Wilson but Bryan; it has been producing men as liberal as Col. House, McAdoo, Glass, Houston, Daniels, Alderman; and it has shown much less of that money-solidarity that is the ruling fact in politics than the northern ruling classes have shown. The Democratic machines in the northern cities are often black spots, but they are mere obstacles. These things are the inertia, existing in any party. With that dull mass a strong

leader can deal. The bulk of the party is made up of the poor, the aspiring. The Republicans have been so long in power that to their party have been drawn those whose dreams are of material advantage, not much enlightened by larger purpose. It is not only the Garys, Lodges, Penroses, Knoxes. It is not even mainly they. It is the young men also, who, almost everywhere at the North, have entered the party because, at the threshold of life, wealth, social glamor, and local power are promised only through that gate. After half a century of scarcely broken rule, the Republican party has an unmistakable dollar bias. It will require great leadership, individual or in the mass, to make it approach in action the liberalism of the Democratic party under Wilson. Had our parties not been so meaningless, the liberals of all parties should have lent their strength to him. It was absurd to find liberal men voting merely on party grounds, with the entrenched system, against the most progressive legislative record of our time, and against principles of equality and justice successfully applied, even in so turbulent a time, to foreign affairs; to the great war; to China, Mexico, South America.

Some progressives care less for such heavy assaults on the underlying system of privilege than they do for what they call social amelioration.

They ought to be satisfied with the record in social welfare. They have seen the eight-hour law applying to work done for the government as well as to work done by the government; an eight-hour law for female employees in the District of Columbia; an eight-hour provision for Post Office clerks and carriers; for civilians engaged in the manufacture of armaments and powder for the government, and in the mining of coal for the navy. The Children's Bureau Law is directed immediately to the welfare of children. The Industrial Commission Law was passed for investigation into the whole subject of industrial relation. The Federal Employment Bureau represented the best study of a profound need. It is fair to say that the greater part of the social side of the Bull Moose platform of 1912 was carried out by the Wilson administration.

Remembering these things there is more reason to blame the American people for the fatal election of 1918 than there is to blame the President; incredibly thoughtless (and in a most literal sense ill-advised) as was the partisan form of his appeal for a supporting legislature. He is guilty of listening to inferior brains. What is the public guilty of? Remember the situation. It is freely admitted that Mr. Wilson has a one-track mind. With the concentration implied in that expression he had formulated and put into statutes the best practicable

American standards of financial freedom. Then he had held us out of the war while he educated us, and educated all Europe, to the desirable objects of the upheaval. His speeches and notes had strengthened the Entente immeasurably, by holding in line its labor and liberal elements, and it had split the German population wide apart. It had in a very large sense won the war. He was then in a most critical situation, representing the world's hope of a settlement that would mean peace and progress, opposed by all the traditional imperialism and fear-politics of Europe. When he needed all his power for this great struggle we, the voters, were so intellectually incompetent that we furnished a hostile legislature, discrediting the President in his contest with European statesmen, and doing more to bring about a bad peace than any one development, unless perhaps it was the discovery by Lloyd George in the khaki election that those speeches which were most successful with his audiences were those in which he made the most extreme promises of reparation and punishment. For this extraordinarily silly vote of the American people it is no alibi to blame the President for his hasty and unwise request for Democrats, or for his unwillingness to have Republican leaders among the peace delegates, or to have a greater number of strong and free personalities. The French have a pro-

found saying that everybody has the defects of his good qualities Occasionally, as in the case of George Washington, it is difficult to apply this saying, but it nearly always holds good, and its application to Mr. Wilson had long been fully realized. An intelligent voting public would not have imperiled a world-situation to punish the discrepancies of a great, progressive, and successful leader.

In truth, the President's awkward political move was not the largest cause of the electoral folly of 1918. The larger cause was the backwardness of the American people in political consciousness. Very recently Mr. Hoover has been criticized because he saw and said that in that election it would be desirable to return a legislature in harmony with the executive. So stupid are we! I once asked Mr. Root, when he was Secretary of State, how the Cabinet stood on a certain course of President Roosevelt's, and he answered that the President's will was so strongly set in the direction indicated that it would be merely wasted labor to attempt to change it. President Wilson's character is of the kind that assumes all the responsibilities that can in any case be interpreted to go with the functions he assumes. He does not play safe. He selects his goal, often distant and illumined, and goes for it. Such a nature creates difficulties for itself, but it accomplishes things that other natures do not ac-

complish. Did Mr. Wilson lose or win his fight at Princeton? There is no yes or no to such questions, but I think he won more ground for his cause than he would have won if he had been more cautious and had thereby held his position. As Governor of New Jersey, it is not the exact value of his legislation that he will be judged by. That legislation was rather a banner, a battle-cry, than a final solution, but if he had not thrown it in the faces of the Jersey bosses and the Jersey corporations he would not have been Woodrow Wilson. When the Federal Reserve act was in debate, I reported to him an occurrence. A leading Wall Street banker had asked me if I thought Mr. Wilson would consider suggestions from financial men about amendments to the Federal Reserve Bill. At that time the financial interests were assuming a threatening manner, and I replied: "I do not know, but I imagine he would, provided the suggestions were made as suggestions, not as attempts to coerce." When I told Mr. Wilson this, he answered: "You did not go far enough. Another condition is that their suggestions should be with the object of carrying out the fundamental objects of this legislation, not of impeding them." In other words, the President meant to go the whole distance, and he did, thus putting on the books one of the few pieces of legislation that can be called really

effective in shaking the hold of the central financial system on our political and business life. A similar example of his tendency to select a strategic point and bend all of his will and intelligence to that point was in his policy of winning the confidence of Latin America and holding it in spite of the Mexican war fever. I have already referred in general terms to his loneliness in that situation, and it would be indiscreet to say explicitly how many members even of his own cabinet had an intervention spasm after the Villa raid, but it may be said that not even Lincoln or Washington ever stood his ground in more inspired isolation than Wilson did in defense of non-interference to the utmost practicable extent. In the long run his policy may lose or it may win. He has done his part.

The man I look upon as probably the most accurate reporter in America came to my apartment, one night in 1916, immediately from the White House, after two hours' talk with Mr. Wilson. My friend was aglow with appreciation of the talk, but especially struck by one remark from that two hours. "What impresses me most," said the President, "is the immovability of our people, the extraordinary amount of work that must be expended to tempt them forward a single inch."

I say that this political conservatism of our people is a dominant cause of the President's failure to

obtain all that he might have obtained at Paris, and that it is too little emphasized. It would do us far more good to dwell on this national inertness than to overdo criticism of Mr. Wilson. If we dwelt on it enough it might even lead us soon to change our constitution, so that such a situation as that created in 1918 could not be brought about and persisted in. We need not go as far as the British. If we could elect our representatives for four years, and our Senators for four, we could usually avoid this folly of deadlock, without giving up our habitual division of power between the three branches. If Congress would merely by resolution invite the cabinet members to appear weekly before Congress and answer questions from all members responsible cabinet government would develop inevitably.

Of course, in November, 1918, Americans did not go to the polls to vote against the Golden Rule or the Sermon on the Mount. They mostly did not know what they were voting about, except sometimes in local detail. Students of economic psychology, however, well know how closely connected is narrowness in foreign affairs with domestic defense of privilege. If there is an excuse for using such words as stand-patriot and patrioteer, it is to modernize Dr. Johnson's famous definition of our kind of patriotism. I do not suppose a Senator had any idea, when he swelled with patriotic hatred of old

world inferiority, or when he was boiling with fear lest the President might succeed in his effort to induce the Entente to act generously, that he was taking the most effective method of sharpening the fight between the specially privileged and the needy many. More long-sighted believers in privilege, indeed, like Lord Milner and Lord Lansdowne, have been in practical proposals far more generous, because they realize that too free an indulgence in patriotic hatred may bring the whole modern industrial system to ruin, hitting rich and poor alike. But few Conservatives take this larger view.

There are in America, particularly in the West, men who sense these things, whether clearly or dimly. Mr. Bryan is such a man, and so is Senator LaFollette. When Bryan endeavored in 1900 to make public ownership of railroads a national issue he had this philosophy in his mind. When he opposed our entering the war his vision included the impeding of human progress by the vagaries of patriotic madness.

Facing God, therefore, the President decided. He saw much being done that was far away from his intentions. I need not go into those things. They were painful, discouraging, disillusioning. Before he went to Paris there was printed in La Victoire a little essay by one of the most distinguished of French publicists. It was a shock to me,

for I knew the man and what he stood for in Paris opinion. The article proposed two statues to celebrate the victory. One was to be to Foch, with a bludgeon as emblem. The other was to be to Wilson, and the emblem was to be a fishing-rod, because of the wily treatment of Germany that finally induced her to sign the armistice. The worst of it was that the man who wrote the article intended his interpretation of the President to be genuine praise. He wholly failed to understand the best things about the President's thinking,—its distance, its honesty, its consistency, and its courage. Most people forget. They are swung by the moment. Mr. Wilson persists. He persists and remembers. The war to him was part of the settlement, and the settlement found the principles in his mind just what they had been before. No doubt a case to disprove this consistency could be made of fragments taken from speeches, especially in his last hectic stumping tour, but we are looking at essentials. To show that in substance he has been consistent we must remember that progress is never a straight line. A skipper is not inconsistent whose course is affected by wind and tide. Were it not so affected he would be no skipper. But his very tacks take their direction not only from wind, tide, and hidden rocks, but always also from the skipper's knowledge of what his destination is. Mr. Wilson's destination has never

changed. It is strange how difficult it is for most people to remember now what the national thought was in September, 1914, after the assault on Belgium, when Col. Roosevelt wrote these words:

"I admire and respect the German people. I am proud of the German blood in my veins. When a nation feels that the issue of a contest in which, from whatever reason, it finds itself engaged will be national life or death, it is inevitable that it should act so as to save itself from death and perpetuate its life.

"(The Belgians) are suffering somewhat as my own German ancestors suffered when Turenne ravaged the Palatinate . . . the suffering is by no means as great. . . .

"When Russia took part, it may well be argued that it was impossible for Germany not to come to the defense of Austria, and that disaster would surely have attended her arms had she not followed the course she actually did follow as regards her opponents on the western frontier. As to her wonderful efficiency—her equipment, the foresight and decision of her general staff, her instantaneous action, her indomitable persistence—there can be nothing but the praise and admiration due a stern, virile, and masterful people, a people entitled to hearty respect for their patriotism and far-seeing self-devotion."

Col. Roosevelt also wrote: "It is certainly eminently desirable that we should remain entirely neutral." The President asked us to keep true to

our thought; with what we knew then nothing except neutrality could be just. His prophetic mind, all too accurately, conceived ahead the destruction, the mixture of good and evil, the seeing red that war would mean, and he asked his people to remain a sane oasis amid war's insanity. His object was ever to keep war as close to the higher reason as it could be kept. When the excitable and well-dressed people and the newspapers were trying to work up a stampede over the Lusitania, he was a hundred times right to hold back, and (whether referring to Mexico, the Lusitania, or only to a general truth) to proclaim himself too proud to fight. Again in 1916 he won on the slogan that he had kept us out of war, which he had done, and heaven knows he hoped he might continue to keep us out seeking the constructive end of an ethical settlement by the exercise of his moral influence. But by developments such a settlement became impossible. "Peace without victory," an expression chosen with great care and held to against protest, represented a far-seeing demand of the President, which was rejected by both sides; and as we were to enter, it was inevitable that we should choose the side against Germany. We did enter, taking every precaution to force the issue onto grounds that would help give value to the peace. Let us not, in our disappointment over the outcome at Paris, forget the great fact that

ethical considerations will not down, and that for the prevalence of those considerations the President deserves more credit than any other man. If he had accomplished no more than the raising of the moral issue, all over the world, it could not yet be said that he had failed. It would indeed have to be said that he had greatly succeeded, for he had moved our standards forward. When he is condemned it is largely on expectations that he himself has made familiar.

But he has gained more for the world than this moral atmosphere. By his sacrifices, as well as by his insistences, he has prepared for the peoples of the world a safer and a higher method of dealing together if they wish to take it. If the free peoples of the world will elect to their parliaments men of forward vision, true liberals, they will have no difficulty in using the League of Nations as an instrument for unceasing progress. Detestable as is much of the settlement, and defective as is much of the procedure, there is nevertheless the opportunity to make the new instrument serve as a genuine medium of progress, and for the very existence of the League we have the President to thank. The League might be far better, but no governmental device is proof against folly or inertia. The success of the League of Nations will be inseparable from the success of home governments in the great powers. The de-

pendence of the League of Nations for its success on enlightened government in the constituent powers was clearly in Mr. Wilson's mind when he signed the treaty. He paced the floor at night, oppressed with the weight of his responsibility, before he decided to remain and sign. What he did was to make a sacrifice, a heavy sacrifice, for the possibility of coöperation and orderly growth. He has said that it is a good treaty, and in the heat of speeches he has over-defended it in detail. It is good only in this broad sense that the League of Nations is an inseparable part of the treaty. Admitting that the President has defended too vehemently separate clauses of it, I am not going to stop, in the midst of colossal considerations, to weigh with nicety and exactment campaign arguments delivered by a man who on the whole goes so far toward saying precisely and consistently what he means. However stupid, hypocritical, even destructive, are many of the items of the peace, yet I say that when Mr. Wilson induced M. Clemenceau, with his earlier jeers at the League, to place the safety of France in the League instead of in the terms advised by Marshal Foch, the President won one of the victories of all time. In that sense he won the peace as he had won the war; and these big moral forces have been lessened by disappointments, but not killed. Knowing as we do how close

to victory Germany came, can we doubt that a decisive influence rested in Mr. Wilson's much-ridiculed notes, undermining German war-feeling, reassuring hesitating labor in England and France, and preparing American opinion for the great efforts of 1917 and 1918? Is there any more reason to doubt that in introducing a moral ideal of victory to millions of people he has made a contribution that can never end, but if democracy is successful, must be one great step in a continuous progress? The one large criticism of him is just but out of proportion. When people emphasize the fact of the President's inability to consult and coöperate in certain ways, they do not nearly as well understand that if ideas and facts are put to him briefly, intelligently, and non-controversially there are few men anywhere who absorb them with more rapidity. A leading characteristic is always the extraordinary rapidity with which he understands, and men frequently imagine they have not had a full hearing because the President does not want to hear them go on saying the same things over again. We should never forget the good side of this aloofness, of this tendency to let the matter rest between himself and God. The first hour that he was actually in office, on the morning of March 5, 1913, he was talking with a friend about the wonderfully high grade of work reached by Thomas Jefferson in contrasting

lines, including architecture and building. Such fineness and excellence of work, the President held, is almost impossible in our day, with the telephone, the newspaper, and the thousand callers. "But one thing the people can count on me for," he said. "I shall not allow my strength to be dissipated; I shall keep the best that is in me free for the important things."

When all is weighed, and perspective is kept, and contemporary bitterness is ignored, that spiritual devotion, far-reaching intelligence, and insistent will, concentrated always on improvement, will be seen as the foundations of Wilson's greatness. History cannot be written yet, and I am not free to discuss just how close to being left out of the treaty the League of Nations Covenant actually was, but this may be said: that if the League of Nations turns out to be a success, and thereby the nations of the earth are saved from again attempting modern expert suicide, the salvation will belong beyond all others to Woodrow Wilson. By prolonged exposition, against endless ridicule, he prepared us for it; by will and through sacrifice he forced it on Paris; and destiny leaves the outcome with the public opinion of the great nations; above all, with the public opinion of Great Britain and the United States.

CHAPTER XI

WHAT IS OUR FAITH?

"A man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth." St. Luke.

"The trouble with democracy is that we democrats do not wish to pay the price: education, education, education: education not in books but in public affairs; education that is current and persistent."
Mr. Justice Brandeis.

"The treasures of heaven are . . . realities of intellect. . . . The modern church crucifies Christ with the head downwards." Blake.

THE future faced to-day cannot be solved by old affirmations, nor can it be solved without destruction of what is selfish in our creeds. Authority is invalid until it has run the gantlet of our questions. We have no faith that is sufficient for life unless our minds are open to the need of things that are not. Our age, product of steam and roller press and cinematograph, scarcely a century old, has still to stabilize itself and fix its values: and much must be destroyed before the moral and intellectual cathedrals of the post-Dar-

win age can arise. Such genius as took place in the Greece of Phidias, the Italy of Lorenzo, the France of the nameless builders of Notre Dame, the England of Elizabeth, or around the lake of Galilee, are determined by circumstance beyond our guess. The steps ahead that we can control are in the spirit of man, the nobility of custom, the worth of life. Our task is not to be inspired but to dig the channels worthiest of inspiration.

I have tried to show that the world-war filled the nations with new lies, as did also the period of disorder that immediately followed. If we look ahead now, into the future, with no other will than to see what we may of the white light of truth, in what direction are we beckoned by our chastened hopes?

We can reach the direction only by putting away the superstitions by which we protect our interests and our baser passions. No doubt the pioneer has a rugged time. He meets a world filled with fear of thought, lest thought change interests and possessions. This is always true, but in war it is still more true, through sanctified wrath, and the hushing of inquiry, while vehement assertion flourishes. From 1914 to 1920 whole nations were propagandized into mental slavery, Americans not least. To remain in these years true to the beliefs of the years preceding was often to remain apart. Few indeed kept toler-

ance; few sided with Jesus against the gentlemen eager to throw stones.

> Jesus was sitting in Moses' chair,
> They brought the trembling woman there.
> Moses commands she be stoned to death,
> What was the sound of Jesus' breath?
> He laid his hand on Moses' law;
> The ancient heavens, in silent awe,
> Writ with Curses from Pole to Pole,
> All away began to roll.

Why are the Ten Commandments more popular than the Sermon on the Mount? In church we cite both, but actually we put some emotion into the tenets of Moses, while in practice we detest those of Jesus. The reason is not hidden. The Ten Commandments are a defense of power and possession. First, the ruling God is not to be interfered with, else will he take vengeance. Secondly, the property of a mortal, including his man-servant and his maid-servant, are not to be stolen.

Heine quotes a description of feasting gods. Then goes on:

"Then suddenly approached, panting, a pale Jew, with drops of blood on his brow, with a crown of thorns on his head, and a great cross laid on his shoulders; and he threw the cross on the high table of the gods, so that the golden cups tottered, and the gods became dumb and pale, and grew even paler, till they at last melted away into vapor."

Moses codified the defense of established institutions. It is easy to read with sympathy laws against

malefactors. Jesus asked us to do something more difficult. Instead of fixing angry attention on unfortunates who are tempted to go against prohibitions, He requested us to make virtue positive, which involves sacrifice and which therefore we prefer to take not too seriously. The Sermon on the Mount invites us to live according to the spirit of Christ, asking little for ourselves, our hearts with those whose needs surpass our own. The few sentences that have come down to us from that sermon indicate that it must have been the noblest picture ever drawn of a life in which freedom means freedom to be true.

I do not imply that the form in which the spiritual life was pictured for Galilee can be applied to our conditions. If we had the spirit, however, the letter would come. Tolstoy lived in a land of peasants; he did not work out the machinery by which the gospel could be successfully applied; but he did the essential. He made Christian ethics throb. Since steam, the machine, and capital have ruled, no such force as Tolstoy has appealed to our youth. He had vision and he had courage, the two things required. He welcomed sorrow, and pitied the satisfied and pampered philistine. For decades he taught the gospel with genius, and at the end he closed the compromises of life by marching off, at 82, to die like a crusader, leaving unfinished "the

Light that shines through Darkness," that harassing picture of reform. We lesser spirits, by liberation of our minds, can find the methods of wedding modern forms and ancient truths, if only we care. But we cannot find the way without the will. We must in our own modern way be born again, in the sense that we must drop luxury and fear as the motives of our effort. No more than in Bunyan's time can the pilgrim proceed without leaving behind him things dear to him. We are lacking in great men. Requiring religious fervor to brace us for the exactions of a new faith we Americans especially find ourselves without our prophets. In the main our ablest men are not serious about what the spirit needs. Ambition rules. Our minds do not find their dreams in what we can give but in what we can get. We dream of promotion, applause, power, of having an automobile, because our neighbor has one. It is those who do not worry about the material scale on which they live, but who are devoted to some idea or affection, who can make the coming shift of power a healthy advance instead of a war. I miss in America the spectacle of many persons, gifted and prominent, who nevertheless live by choice with frugality, calm, and independence, and I find too many who measure the value of life by conspicuousness and pomp. In preceding chapters I have indicated channels that may lead, without

paroxysms, toward a life containing some religion in action; but those steps cannot be taken with success unless a change of heart comes, so that fears and hopes cease to be centered on clogging requirements. If the words of Jesus cannot give us the mechanical details by which we can pass to a more generous age, they can point the way; and when He speaks of the eye of a needle He should not be taken as calling by the name of rich only vast proprietors, but rather all of us who are capitalists, and use our capital selfishly, and dream of ever more capital. The man who votes against a heavier inheritance tax, or for indirect taxes on necessities, in order to protect his privileges, or confines his dreams to his material advance and successful competition, surely comes within the principle that Jesus was considering. So great a revolution of the spirit would be long in the making even if most of the clergy were working to inspire it; if most of the lawyers were concentrating their minds on how to help it function. Arthur Henderson spoke accurately when he said: "A backward glance at the history of the 19th century will show that the people have been steadily extending the range of their influence in politics and affairs, without any very clear notion of what they were doing or how the final steps in the conquest of political power by organized democracy were to be surmounted." To help the mass to sur-

mount those steps intelligently and to help the possessing classes to share their power, not forced by disaster but beckoned by faith, is the worthiest life that any of us can live. Is it not thrilling to live in a world-revolution? The call is not as obviously strong as in certain other epochs: perhaps, indeed, the call to the truest faith and the steadiest independence has never been melodramatic. I suppose the worth of a lifetime in which we seek only an intelligent and busy life for ourselves, our wives, and our children, and dream our dreams freed from wordly rubbish, cannot possibly come to the majority until our system of education can be changed. It could not possibly be changed under a capitalistic system entirely unmitigated, though it could flourish under a combination of reduced capitalism, highly developed coöperation of many kinds, and national functions, better than it could under any bureaucratic system of socialism or communism. The changes, however, in order to usher in a better order than our own, must not be undertaken as tricks in defense of blatant competition. Such low arguments as that man will not make effort except in the service of the self-indulgent and autocratic parts of his nature must be abandoned. We all know they are false and they are put forward merely as defenses by those who wish to clothe their golden calf in pleasant raiment. Usually when I

have written for the conservative classes, urging acquiescence and help in the social revolution, I have done it on the ground that if they did not help the movement they and their children would be the sufferers; but I have been at heart sorry to appeal to fear. To avoid chaos and hate and suffering at some date not so incredibly distant, even in America, is, to be sure, a sound and sufficient reason for dealing creatively with our problem; but our spirit would be more satisfied if we could appeal merely to love and faith; not to fear but to a universal hope. When our school books are rewritten, when thousands of newspapers and periodicals are owned by groups that use the power of the press for other purposes than money-making, when no man is honored because he wastes more than his fellows, when the great material needs of life, that are limited in amount, are in the hands of the community, when the great mass of ordinary business is in one form or another coöperative, then shall we be able to guide the flood of human thought and purpose away from personal ambition and fear. Then may they be guided to what the best of men's teachers have always preached, to a life in which sympathy and reason are the master-motives. It cannot be said that such a life has heretofore failed, for it has never been tried. Individuals have lived it, but organized society has never made the effort. For

the first time since the world began we have the natural and technical resources. Therefore such a life is more possible to-day than ever in the past, granted the will; granted a will so strong and moral as to be rightly called religious.

Deacidified using the Bookkeeper process.
Neutralizing agent: Magnesium Oxide
Treatment Date: JUN 2001
PreservationTechnologies
A WORLD LEADER IN PAPER PRESERVATION
111 Thomson Park Drive
Cranberry Township, PA 16066
724) 779-2111

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 007 706 191 5